The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1932 NUMBER 933

Contents

The Week 243

Editorials

Hoover's Tragedy 246
Real Estate Men on Trial 247

General Articles

Uncle Shylock Helps the Farmers..Owen P. White 249
Waiting for 1936.....Bruce Bliven 252
Moment in a Changing World (verse)..Yvor Winters, Helen Cornelius, Mark Van Doren, Louis Untermeyer, Léonie Adams, Harold Lewis Cook, Margaret Mead and Raymond Holden... 254
Lifting the Farmers Out of the Mud..... .....Gifford Pinchot 256
Washington Notes .....T. R. B. 258
Screen Version.....Stark Young 259
Contra Ernest Newman.....Paul Rosenfeld 261

Correspondence 263

Reviews of Books

Henry, William and Henry.....Constance Rourke 265
Where There's Smoke.....Joseph Freeman 266
"Shootes of Everlastingnesse".....Kenneth White 267
The Dispossessed.....Lionel Trilling 267
Prohibition and the Courts....Osmond K. Fraenkel 268
Book Notes 268

The Week

PRESIDENT Hoover's talent for getting in wrong whenever he speaks has been amusingly illustrated by the results of his great effort at Des Moines. This speech, which was to be a rallying cry for his retreating forces and which did in fact stimulate enthusiasm among the more loyal Republicans, nevertheless adversely affected the very economic factors which Mr. Hoover represents himself as being solely competent to safeguard. The first thing that happened after his argument that he was really the true friend of the farmers was a decline in the price of wheat. At the same time the stock market registered a dramatic fall. The action of these markets is an established fact and is a commentary all by itself on the great guardian of prosperity-around-the-corner. A rumor—for which we cannot vouch—accounts for the drop in wheat and stocks by the assertion that the speculators had been accumulating both on the tip that the Des Moines speech would announce a really effective program of emergency farm aid. When the program appeared, it was such a dud that everybody unloaded and there was little support. Apparently men with money to risk do not really believe that the tariff can aid grain prices, or that by some hocus-pocus we can use the war-debt payments directly to enlarge foreign markets.

NO SOONER had disaster overtaken Mr. Hoover's good intention in the grain and stock markets than weakness appeared in the dollar on the foreign exchange markets. Having read Mr. Hoover's strange declaration that he and his party had, by a heroic struggle, saved the gold standard in the United States—a statement which was meant to be the keystone of his speech and the basis of a belief in his special fitness to be President—foreigners immediately began to withdraw their American balances and thus threaten another outflow of gold. The reasons for this response are obvious. If we actually had been only two weeks from the necessity of going off gold, we might easily fall into danger again. And if the Democrats really are bent on insane measures which would destroy the soundness of the currency, their impending accession to power, clearly indicated in all reliable forecasts, is indeed menacing to confidence. In order to repair the damage done, financial spokesmen had to point to facts which proved not only that danger to the gold standard is now remote, but that it probably was so at the time the heroic fight was presumably being waged. And to cap the climax, Senator Glass, the acknowledged congressional authority on banking and currency, issued a statement that he never heard of any urgent danger to the gold standard except that embodied in measures suggested by administration forces themselves.

IN OUR longer editorial on the Hoover Des Moines speech we deal with some of the more glaring campaign howlers in it—notably, the astounding contention that going off the gold standard would have been injurious to debtors. But another, pointed out by numerous commentators, is President Hoover's assumption of credit for balancing the budget. The record, available for anyone who can read and remember the simplest facts, establishes that (a) the budget is still far from balanced, (b) the Republicans, by reducing taxes during prosperity, contributed largely to the fiscal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

difficulties of the government when depression arrived, (c) during the first year of depression, when the budget deficit was accumulating, and The New Republic and others pointed out the necessity of increasing taxes, the President recommended and obtained a tax reduction. His conversion to budget balancing occurred only at the late date when the wisdom of that policy, after all that had come before, was open to serious question. For the drive for a balanced budget then took the form of drastically restricting public expenditures at a time when they ought to be expanded, and seeking revenue from sales taxes which would have placed further burdens on the poor. If public finance had been well managed by the Republicans, they would have kept taxes on incomes and profits high enough during prosperity so that we could either have accumulated a surplus or have paid off the war debt more rapidly. In either case we could have pursued a policy of wise spending during depression with far less danger to the soundness of governmental finances.

NEW YORK CITY has just offered as beautiful an illustration of practical politics as you could ask. As everyone now knows, the Tammany-controlled Walker administration was corrupt from top to bottom; if ever a reform administration was needed, it is now. Yet the Republican machine, headed by Sam Koenig, who in a long public career has never to our knowledge done one praiseworthy thing, proceeded to make a secret alliance with Tammany. In exchange for a judgeship for Samuel H. Hofstadter, who conducted the legislative investigation, Koenig undoubtedly agreed to put up a straw man for the mayoralty, making a Tammany success certain. The Hall turned thumbs down on acting Mayor McKee, who has made an amazingly good record for himself in a few weeks in office. McKee and Tammany are at outs and Tammany therefore refused to support him. Instead, it put up an absolute nonentity, Surrogate John P. O'Brien, a man of whom nobody ever heard and one without qualification for public office except that he is a fawning "Yes man" for Boss Curry. McKee could in all probability have won if he were put forward as a Fusion candidate of the Republicans and the Bronx Democrats; but having been knifed in the back by Edward J. Flynn, the Bronx Democratic leader, and ignored by Koenig, he decided—no doubt wisely—that his public career is, for the present at least, at an end. Mr. Koenig proceeded to carry out his share of the bargain by naming as Republican candidate a push-over, a seventy-one-year-old party hack from Brooklyn, named Lewis H. Pounds.

THERE is little doubt that Boss Curry would have run Jimmie Walker again if he could; and that he was only frightened out of this by the coercion of Al Smith and the threat that Roosevelt himself would take the stump against Jimmie. In a limited and partial way, this may have represented personal loyalty by the boss for his likable, scapegrace ally; but in the main, it was loyalty to Tammany's money policy, the policy which is the final factor in all the Hall's decisions. Jimmie had become identified in the public mind as the representative of the system; and it is the system which keeps Tammany going. If it did not give jobs to the rank and file and rich pickings to the leaders, it could never survive. The Republican machine—quite as corrupt as Tammany but weaker—is part of the system, as the deal with Sam Koenig clearly shows. As a result, we have one of the two largest cities in the world faced with the prospect of at least another year of wasteful, incompetent, dishonest Tammany administration; we see the findings of the Seabury Committee torn up and scattered to the winds; we see New York's financial credit imperiled at a time of crisis, her administration of relief for her 1,135,000 unemployed continuing to be graft-ridden at a time when every cent of money is needed for legitimate assistance. None of this need be necessary, of course, if a majority of her citizens had the sense to vote for Morris Hillquit, the Socialist candidate for mayor—but why pretend that the citizens of New York have any sense?

IN The New Republic of September 28 appeared an article by Robert E. Asher, "The Jobless Help Themselves," telling what the Chicago Workers' Committee on Unemployment is doing to help rescue its members. This article did not describe the activities of the organized charity of Chicago, since the author and the editors of The New Republic took it for granted that our readers knew of this work, which is similar to what is being done in every other large city of the country and has been mentioned in a number of previous editorials and articles in this paper. In order, however, to prevent the possibility of any misunderstanding it should be pointed out that through the formal agencies for relief, food and other assistance has been given to some 700,000 persons. All told, $50,000,000 has been raised during the past two years from various sources. Private charity has obtained $10,000,000, $18,000,000 was appropriated under a state law, and $14,000,000 has been borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In obtaining and distributing these funds, public-spirited citizens have coöperated with social workers. At times, money has been spent when there were no appropriations to cover it, in order to prevent starvation.

THE appointment of Julius Gömbös to be Prime Minister of Hungary a few days ago, after the Parliament had turned out Count Julius Karolyi, the conservative relative of the well known radical, reflects the growing disintegration of Hungary's political and economic life. The landed aristocracy and agrarian interests have forced the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adoption of exorbitant tariffs on all food products, until the country has been brought to a state of economic self-sufficiency as isolated as that of the eighteenth century. The export of industrial products has fallen until industrial unemployment exceeds Hungary's worst experience in the past. Since the country has neither unemployment insurance nor state unemployment relief, misery has become so widespread as to make radicals not only of the workers but of the few members of the middle class as well. The execution, a few weeks ago, of the two Communists Sallay and Karikas for propaganda, shows to what length the rulers of Hungary are prepared to go. Julius Gömbös is the man for a job of this kind. A professional soldier of the coarsest type, he became infamous as the butcher of the Hungarian counter-revolution after the Communist, Bela Kun, was overthrown.

FOR years, Gömbös devoted himself to the formation of a Fascist party movement of the small farmers. His political organization in a few years became such a factor in Hungarian politics that Bethlen and his successor, Karolyi, were forced to make their peace with him and to appoint him to the War Ministry in their Cabinets. Gömbös, who was deeply involved in the franc-forgery scandal of Prince Ludwig Windisch-Grätz, is an admirer of Mussolini and will endeavor to mold Hungarian politics after the Italian model. He has already announced his intention of dissolving Parliament should that body, in which he expects to be backed not only by his own party but by other agrarian organizations, refuse to endorse his government. His program includes the issuance of new regulations that will raise the election age from twenty-two to twenty-five years and the reversal of the present status which gives a secret ballot to voters in the cities and an open ballot to the farm population. Under the combined rule of the ruthless Horthy and the bloodthirsty Gömbös, the semi-dictatorship will now develop into a real fascist state.

IT IS difficult to say at this writing whether the attempt to bring the Insull brothers back to Chicago for trial is political in character. The authorities of that city stood by and permitted the Insulls to commit their crimes; indeed, as readers of the recent series of articles in The New Republic by Marquis W. Childs are aware, these authorities on occasion were hearty collaborators. Now, however, when the harm has all been done, they propose to return the brothers from their voluntary exile and try them, knowing that the action will be popular among the thousands of persons who lost money in the Insull debacle, but knowing also that it will not serve to bring any of that money back. Everyone will agree, of course, that if the technical charges against the Insulls are well founded, they ought to be punished; but intelligent people must realize that their real sin was one which is condoned by public officials and public opinion in this country—the sin of pyramiding stock values, of financial prestidigitation for the vast benefit of their own pockets. Meanwhile, for sheer drama few things have equaled the spectacle of Samuel Insull, the stronger of the two brothers, who a few months ago was one of America's richest, most respected men, his fortune gone, fleeing desperately from European city to city and at last taking refuge, by airplane, in Greece, under the impression that he cannot be extradited from there.

THE earthquake of depression brings many lofty structures toppling to the ground. S. W. Straus and Company of New York, one of the largest and oldest of real-estate bond houses, has just been put into receivership by action of the New York supreme court, which found that it had been guilty of fraud, within the terms of the state law, in selling "general mortgage" bonds to persons who believed them to be based on first mortgages, and in selling bonds which were not in good standing because the properties behind them were in default on taxes. Company officials intend to appeal from the receivership decision, on the ground that the practices complained of were suspended about eighteen months ago—which somehow reminds one of the girl who was "studying to be a virgin." On the same day, two other important court decisions were given affecting S. W. Straus and Company. One of these confirmed a previous order that the company should not proceed with its plans for reorganizing the Hotel Delmonico, New York, on the ground that these plans do not adequately safeguard the rights of the bondholders; and the other also supported a previous order, that the list of bondholders in a certain property should be made available to individual members so that they might communicate with each other for their common interest. It has often been pointed out that as long as the house keeps the list of bondholders secret, the individuals on it are almost helpless. All these decisions, of course, come under the head of locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen; the losses of many millions of dollars will not be made up because of them; but they will help to salvage something from the wreckage, and for that reason are thoroughly welcome.

IN OUR correspondence columns this week there is a letter soliciting funds for the relief of the families of the striking miners in Illinois. More than food and clothing for women and children is at stake in this struggle, however. The Illinois miners' movement represents another rank-and-file attempt to build a new international miners' union, free from the corruption and the economic stupidity which have characterized the United Mine Workers under the presidency of John L. Lewis. A constitutional convention to set up the Progressive Mine Workers of America has recently been held at Gillespie. In addition to support from a large

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part of the rank and file in Illinois, the new organization expects the adherence of the independent West Virginia miners' union and of units across the Canadian border. Numerous previous efforts to free the miners from reactionary leadership have failed, but the chances are that sometime one will succeed. There is no greater need today in the American labor movement—indeed, in the essential process of industrial reorganization—than a militant, competent and inclusive miners' union. If this new movement is to attract support from the other great coal fields, it must first establish itself in Illinois, and in order to do that it must gain control over wages and hours by recognition in the state. That is the larger stake for which the existing battle is being waged.

Hoover's Tragedy

HERBERT HOOVER'S defense of his administration at Des Moines is like the climax of a Greek tragedy. It represents, as in Aristotle's definition, the struggle against inexorable fate of a good but not wholly guiltless man. Elected four years ago on the flood tide of success and fame, he now faces certain and probably overwhelming rejection because of the misfortunes which have overtaken both him and his people. Though he still thinks of these misfortunes as being undeserved, their origins are inextricably interwoven with his own past. He was a part of the administration which led the country up the mountain and to the brink of the precipice, and he took credit for the ascent. He was blind to what lay ahead; he grasped responsibility by the plea that still greater triumphs awaited us in the same line of march. Disaster took him unawares.

He is conscious of having waged an unremitting battle for his followers according to the best of his lights; it hurts him deeply that they have turned away. He himself was an Iowa farm boy, nurtured in the spirit of pioneer individualism; he has done what any such boy of sufficient character and intelligence would have been expected to do. What is the matter? In contrast with his former vaulting hopes, the best he can say is, it might have been worse. He has been in daily contact with the perplexities and details of what has happened, but he does not understand its essence. He refers to the root causes as an Athenian might have referred to the mythical vengeance of a god—something profound, universal, beyond the ken of little man. But he still clings desperately to hope.

How much he has tried to do, and how little he knows what are the effects of what he does, are clearly shown in the more detailed economic sections of his speech. His own understanding of economics remains, as it always has been, muddy and confused; but certain strains of clarity have obviously been introduced by the banker type of mind. He has taken over from men like Ogden Mills and Eugene Meyer a rationale of the way to fight depression and restore prosperity; and because he has been made to see so much more clearly in this direction than in any other, he has persuaded himself that doing what the bankers wanted done was really in the best interest of the Iowa farmers, the debtor classes in general and the unemployed. He has created a fable about the fight for a sound policy which in parts is true, in other parts conceals the truth, and in some important respects presents a grotesque distortion.

Take his defense of "sound money." What does he mean by it? A dollar which does not change in purchasing power over commodities? At times he seems to mean this, as when he tells the farmers that what they need now is higher prices. But at other times he talks of "dangerous inflation" when he opposes measures calculated to restore prices to something like their former level. Most of the time, as when he denounces "tampering with the currency," he really adopts the bankers' point of view that sound money is money which has a constant value in gold, no matter how much gold may have appreciated in terms of commodities. This, of course, really leads in time of depression to a deflationary policy. It constitutes serving, not the debtors, but the creditors. The owners of bonds and mortgages who are paid interest and principal at a time when prices are abnormally low make an immense profit at the expense of those who borrowed the money from them at a higher price level. This obvious fast seems utterly to have escaped Mr. Hoover. He ignores it entirely, for instance, in his argument that going off the gold standard would have injured the debtors. There he speaks only of the fact that paying the principal of gold bonds, in currency at a discount in gold, would be a hardship. But how large a proportion of debt must be paid in gold? Ordinary farm mortgages certainly are not gold debts, and even the interest on "gold bonds" does not have to be paid in gold. In any case, if inflation had occurred as a result of going off the gold standard, the increase in commodity prices would have gone a long way to cancel any disadvantage to debtors caused by the depreciation of currency in terms of gold. If this part of Mr. Hoover's speech had been delivered by a man more expert in the subject, it would have to be put down as deliberate misrepresentation.

His story of the heroic fight against abandonment of the gold standard seems to have been exaggerated for campaign purposes. At no time was the gold standard in the United States threatened by the withdrawal of gold from our banking reserves by foreigners. They could take only as much gold as their available funds here could buy; the amount of these was known, and was too small to threaten the adequacy of the reserves. When foreigners had taken about all they could in this way, gold exports stopped, and this in turn aided confidence in this country. This eventuality was not due to any administration policy; it was automatic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and predictable; and it was in fact predicted. Only Americans could have put us off the gold standard by hoarding gold or sending it abroad, wherever they might think capital was safer. But such a refuge was hard to find. Domestic hoarding was, of course, extensive, but most of it was in the form, not of gold, but of currency. The motive for much of the hoarding was undoubtedly fear of bank failures rather than fear for the currency. The Glass-Steagall Act helped to stem the tide of bank failures; it was also constructive in that it made possible the pursuit of an aggressive policy of buying government bonds by the Federal Reserve Banks. But this was a different matter entirely. To represent it chiefly as a heroic defense of the gold standard is sheer melodrama.

Again, the "sound" policy of balancing the budget was a bankers' policy, pursued in the interest of financial institutions—our great creditors. It may be argued cogently that only by protecting these interests at all costs could we, within the limits of the capitalist system, prepare the way for a possible revival. But it is either disingenuous or stupid to represent this course as being in the immediate interest of debtors, farmers and the unemployed. On the contrary, it shifts to them a major part of the losses of the depression. Why? Because the rigid economy necessary to produce a balanced budget limits governmental expenditures at the very time when it is most necessary to expand them as a means of unemployment relief, direct aid to debtors and a really adequate program of public works which may create employment, put money in circulation and tend to raise prices. Hoover's claim to credit for a large public-works program is wholly false. Public works have greatly contracted during the depression. He has fought every measure which really would have led to a net expansion. If he had wanted at all costs to aid the unfortunate and increase prices, he would have enlarged governmental expenditures and would have borrowed the money with which to do so. Thus he would have risked further depreciation of bond prices and injured the creditor class. What he really did was to try to save the capitalist system by saving the creditors at the expense of the population at large, letting the devil take the hindmost. But he will not admit the necessary cruelty of this process, or accept as just the resentment of those whom it has injured. He smooths it over with fallacious, though probably sincere, sophistry.

The most glaring of his confusions is of course that in relation to tariff and farm relief. When reviewing this subject he neglected entirely to mention the one important American farm industry which is really kept alive by the tariff—sugar growing. To mention it might have been embarrassing. But how can he possibly keep on pretending that protection is of the slightest advantage to grain and cotton growers, or even to most of the livestock raisers? In the case of cotton, of course, the protectionists have not even made the bluff of giving it a tariff. If economics is certain about anything, it is certain that farmers who raise crops, a large part of which must be exported, cannot benefit from a tariff. The farmers have learned this by bitter experience. And yet Mr. Hoover solemnly and even with emotion hands them the same old bunk. A President who tries to enlarge an export market while obstructing imports exemplifies one of the most obvious and destructive contradictions of nationalist capitalism.

In these contradictions is the bitter essence of Mr. Hoover's tragedy, to which he is totally blind. On every hand he is enmeshed in contradictions. The very optimism and the aggressive devices of prosperity, in which he played so large a part, made depression inevitable. Once depression had come, he could not defend the system with which he is identified without protecting favored classes at the expense of the disinherited and unfortunate. Something like Fate drives him to incur the hostility of the people, to suffer defeat and dishonor, because every effort he makes in pursuit of the faith which he blindly accepts injures those whom he thinks he is serving.

Real Estate Men on Trial

MILLIONS of people in the United States today are inadequately housed. In a few cases (as with the inhabitants of Park Avenue, New York City) it is because they simply have not enough knowledge or intelligence to demand decent standards; but with the overwhelming majority, it is poverty which forces them into crowded, badly lighted, insanitary dwellings which take a heavy toll in crime and disease. This is not a new problem; it has always existed, though conditions in the post-war years have made it much worse. At bottom, it is an economic question; two-thirds of the American city dwellers of today cannot afford to pay, either through ownership or rent, what private business charges for building new houses which conform to the present-day minimum standards. Sooner or later our civilization must be made over to remedy this condition; but in the meantime the only alternatives are to let things go as they are, or to give state aid of some sort so that the children of the poor will have at least a fighting chance for life.

As many of our readers know, the Emergency Relief Act of 1932, which increased the resources of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to nearly four billion dollars, provided that out of the new fund of $2,100,000,000 loans might be made for limited-dividend housing projects. These projects are similar to those which are familiar in New York State. They provide, in essence, for housing far superior to anything available for the poor man under strictly private auspices. This is made possible by large-scale operation, by low land

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

costs obtained, where necessary, through condemnation proceedings, by tax-exemption for a period of years and by obtaining money (heretofore, from persons partly motivated by philanthropic impulses) at rates which are limited to 5 or, at most, 6 percent. Under these circumstances it is possible in spite of high land values, even in certain parts of New York City itself, to provide large, light, well built rooms, modern plumbing, central heating and, most important of all, two-thirds of the land area left vacant for use in gardens, lawns and playgrounds. The enormous superiority of such housing over anything which strictly private enterprise presents at a comparable price is too obvious to need underlining.

It happens that heretofore, the terms of the new federal law have been met only in New York State (until last week, when a similar statute was adopted in Ohio). It became necessary therefore to introduce bills, modeled on the New York law, in other states, and this was done in a number of them, including Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Indiana and Illinois. Yet strange to say, in not one of these states has such a law been passed. Although every one of them has a tremendous unemployment problem, particularly bad in the building trades; although every one of them is terribly in need of housing of the sort the R.F.C. proposes to give, for some mysterious reason it has been impossible (except, as we have said, in Ohio) to get a permissive state law adopted.

Why is this so? One reason is the opposition of the farmers. Although such housing projects are "self-liquidating" and practically non-speculative, the money must be borrowed from the R.F.C. and the state itself must spend a little for supervision of the projects. The farmers, suffering the burden of heavy taxes, and not caring much how city people live, are opposed to the project. But there is another element in opposition, and far less creditably than are the farmers: the real-estate men and the private building industry. These gentlemen are campaigning, openly or secretly, against R.F.C. housing projects. They are calling the law "lop-sided," "hasty," the product of "economic narrowness." They object to having the whole country build multi-family types of housing which, they say, are appropriate only to New York City —as though the law demanded some one type, and as though apartment houses were unknown outside the metropolis! They declare, flying in the face of all experience, that large-scale operation is not more economical than small. Their final and truly comical argument, if you have ever seen a slum and also a limited-dividend housing experiment, is that the latter creates too great density of population!

The real heart of the matter, from the real-estate men's point of view, is found in their demand that no building shall be done which "imperils existing property values." The less housing is available, the higher the rents which can be extorted from the tenant, as everyone remembers who went through the housing shortage after the War. The present owners of houses occupied by the poor are afraid that with government money, new buildings may be erected which will take away their tenants; and they rationalize this fear by criticizing the "social values" inherent in such a program as is envisaged by the New York State housing law. They point out that many real-estate companies are on the brink of bankruptcy, and that if they go over, lending institutions, such as insurance companies, which have invested money in their properties, will also be imperiled. All this is quite true, and it would be foolish to minimize their plight. Where they are wrong is in failing to recognize that their own recovery depends upon general recovery; and that general recovery will be aided more by projects such as the R.F.C. has under consideration than by almost anything else. And in any case, the amount of building which is contemplated would not seriously affect the housing situation in the country as a whole. At the most, a few thousand families will be housed decently at a price which the poor can afford to pay. The chief usefulness of such building will be as an object lesson—to show what can be done for $8 or $10 or $12 per room per month. It will permit experimentation, of the most useful possible sort, in regard to new types of building, new proportions of ground coverage and other technical matters, offering innovations in regard to which private enterprise is always extremely backward. Instead of putting the private interests out of business, it would give them a little real competition of a healthy character.

The cry to "let us alone" now coming from the real-estate men has often been heard before in the land. It was heard when the railroads at first refused to install safety appliances at the request of the public. The steel mills said "let us alone" when it was suggested that they abolish the twelve-hour day. Employers of child labor talked about "rugged individualism" when the practice was protested. Those who fight for "their rights" are undoubtedly honest and sincere. But in the long run, the rights of the public are paramount.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1932, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT. DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK ALVIN JOHNSON
E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD GILBERT SELDES
R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS: FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Uncle Shylock Helps the Farmers

How Federal Land Banks Gain by Foreclosing Mortgages

FORECLOSING farm mortgages, as the Federal Land and Joint Stock Land Banks now practise it, is rapidly becoming a major racket whereby these quasi-governmental institutions are garnering millions of dollars. The process, although painful to the farmers, is really a simple operation for the banks. Having sold farm-loan bonds at par to the public against the hundreds of thousands of farm mortgages which they hold, these banks are now engaged in the profitable business of foreclosing liens, selling farms for whatever they will bring and then using the proceeds of these sales to repurchase their own bonds at a heavy discount. Inasmuch as these banks besought Congress last December for alms, which, it may be added, were passed out to them in large and substantial chunks, it is interesting to look somewhat carefully into their set-up and activities.

During 1931 these two classes of banks, claiming that they must be hard-boiled because they had to pay interest on $1,700,000,000 of tax-free bonds which they had sold, instituted foreclosure proceedings against 16,601 American farmers. In a statement issued by the press department of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau the federal government is relieved of all responsibility for ousting these men and their families from their homes, the argument being based on the grounds that inasmuch as no federal money was ever loaned to the farmers, the government cannot be held responsible for the foreclosures.

To the dispossessed farmers, however, this denial sounds like so much plain bunk. They can read, and when they see the legend, "Federal Farm Loan Bureau" painted on one of the doors of the Treasury Department; when they note that the annual report of foreclosure proceedings instituted by the Land Banks bears the signature of Ogden L. Mills, Secretary of the Treasury; when they remember that about $600,000 per annum of the taxpayers' money, for which there is no return whatever, is paid by the Treasury to cover the overhead of the Federal Land Banks, they very naturally conclude that there is some rather close connection between their paternal government and the fact that they are now homeless.

But what is that connection? Let us see. To begin with, we must get it clearly in mind that, although their missions in life are somewhat similar, there is no real relationship between the Federal Farm Board and the Federal Farm Loan Bureau. Of the former, which has failed to prevent the farmer's being deprived of the profit from his land, we will have nothing to say in this article. The Farm Loan Bureau, however, which has gone far to deprive him of the land itself, we will consider at some length.

The Farm Loan Bureau was created by the Farm Loan Act of 1916 for the purpose of establishing and thereafter supervising banks which could extend ample credit to farmers. The banks so organized were the Federal Land Banks, of which there are twelve in a coöperative chain with joint liability, and the Joint Stock Banks, of which only fifty-three are now independently operating, though there is no legal reason why there should not be any number of them.

The difference in the set-up of these two kinds of banks is important. The Federal Land Banks make their loans chiefly through and with the endorsement of Farm Loan Associations, which are chartered organizations composed exclusively of their own borrowers. The borrower who obtains a loan from the Federal Land Bank through an association must subscribe 5 percent of his loan to stock in the association, while the association in its turn must subscribe for an equal amount of stock in the bank. Thus, with the Farm Loan Associations acting as intervening holding companies, these twelve Federal Land Banks are actually the private property of a large number of private citizens, and were meant to be coöperative in nature. Though the borrowers have acquired the requisite amount of stock, they have been deprived of management of these banks by subsequent legislation which has been passed in Washington.

The Joint Stock Banks differ in that they are not coöperative in any sense. They are privately organized institutions definitely run for profit. Chartered under the Farm Loan Act for that sole purpose, they make long-term loans, secured by first mortgages, directly to farmers.

Ever since 1917, when, under this form of ownership, these banks began operations, they have both enjoyed the quasi-governmental privilege of issuing tax-free bonds, characterized as "instrumentalities of the government," against the mortgages which they take from the farmers. Furthermore, as their one recognized source of profit, the law allows them a spread of one percent between the interest collected from the farmers and the interest paid on their bonds. Thus all that was necessary for these banks to do was to find farmers in search of loans and buyers who would take their bonds.

By a deception which the United States Treasury Department tacitly supported by maintaining a discreet silence, both these objects were

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

easily attained. The magic but meaningless phrase, "instrumentalities of the government," coupled with widespread national prosperity, brought in such a volume of business that during the relatively brief period of fourteen years which ended December 31, 1931, these banks submitted to the United States Treasury, for its approval to issue bonds against them, 635,926 farm mortgages representing the huge sum of $2,449,325,856. Of course some of these mortgages, along with a corresponding amount of the bonds, have been liquidated. Thus on March 31 of this year there were outstanding only $1,164,609,815 of Federal Land Bank bonds, and $536,410,260 of those issued by the Joint Stock Land Banks.

These are large figures, but just what do they mean? Briefly this: first that the Land Banks, under their authorized spread, are entitled to a "take" of $17,000,000 a year in interest. Second, that a great number of American investors, believing as a rule that they were buying guaranteed government bonds, have loaned a colossal sum of money, on the security of farm mortgages alone, to a veritable army of farmers nearly all of whom, as the third significant item, believed that they were borrowing directly from the national Treasury and hence from a lenient creditor.

Obviously any so-called banking system primarily designed to aid agriculture, but practising the system I have outlined, is fundamentally unsound. Of course any banking system is unsound for any purpose except profit-making, if we must have successive booms and depressions. This one defeats its own purpose because, being dependent solely upon farmers for the income to meet its own bond obligations, it cannot be lenient with them when they most need it. In other words, during a decade or more of general prosperity and agricultural expansion, when the farmers could pay their interest and amortization instalments regularly and really did not need to borrow, but only did so because of the temptation to equip themselves with such non-self-liquidating perquisites as city-built homes and upholstered limousines, everything was rosy for the Land Banks.

This is not now the case. Owing to the concentration of their obligations and the limitation of their authorized income to one source, the agricultural depression has hit them harder than it has hit agriculture. Sixty-four percent of the farms in the United States are still unmortgaged, and of those that are mortgaged only about 12 percent have been, so far, unable to carry their load. Thus agriculture, on the whole, is as solvent as industry; perhaps more so. The Land Banks, on the other hand, find themselves in a tight place. Twelve per-cent of delinquencies, coupled with the depreciation of land values and the collapse of the bond market, has put them there—and what have they done about it?

It would have been best, perhaps, if they had done nothing. Unfortunately, in looking out for their own welfare these banks have discovered a technique whereby they can actually make a substantial profit out of the fact that farmer Jones cannot pay his interest and that, therefore, they must foreclose on him and sell him out. It works this way. Mr. Jones's farm was appraised at $20,000; the bank loaned him $10,000 on it and against that loan immediately issued and sold an equal amount of bonds at par. In the case of the Joint Stock Land Banks, these bonds are now down to about 30. When Mr. Jones, discovering that he is unable, through no fault of his own, to meet his interest payment, applies for an extension, what does the bank do? It forecloses as fast as it can, sells his $20,000 farm—which, at pre-depression prices is now worth $30,000 because most of the loan went into a new dwelling house—for $6,000, which sum it immediately uses for the repurchase of $20,000 worth of its own bonds at the prevailing market price.

In connection with the above transaction several interesting things have happened. The owners of the bonds, who bought them under the impression that they were government securities, have lost $14,000. Mr. Jones, who thought that he was borrowing from a lenient creditor, has lost his $20,000 farm and doesn't know what he will do with his family this coming winter. The market value of all farm lands adjacent to the Jones property has been sharply depressed; likewise their value as collateral in case they are mortgaged. As the consequence of all these losses the Land Bank has come out of the deal with a clean, to use the word in its colloquial sense, profit of $10,000.

Nor does the above illustration represent an exceptional case. On the contrary, this device of playing the bondholder against the farmer is well recognized as a means whereby the needy bankers can alleviate their present distress. The Joint Stock Bank of Detroit, for example, using funds obtained from selling out farmers, has in fourteen months repurchased $1,125,000 worth of its own bonds at an average price of 53, while the St. Louis institution has been accused (at a hearing held by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House last March) of having made for itself a profit of $3,200,000 in two years by the same process.

From the farmers there has, of course, come a protest. What they would like to know is this: The only security back of the bonds which the banks have sold is the farmers' land, and therefore why shouldn't they, too, be granted the same privilege as the banks: that is, of buying the bonds at present depressed prices and with them liquidating their own mortgages? To this proposition the banks have been able to oppose no equitable objection. There is none, and yet with one voice all the Land Banks, backed by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Farm

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Loan Commissioner, oppose granting the farmer such a privilege on the ground that it would not be fair to the banks.

There is no doubt that the present policy of the Treasury is to be "fair to the banks," especially the twelve Federal Land Banks, irrespective of the treatment which these banks have accorded to the farmers. Last December Congress passed a bill handing $125,000,000 over to these twelve banks. Under this bill $25,000,000 was to be used to provide extensions for farmers who, as President Hoover said when he signed the act, "were unable, temporarily, to make the grade," while the remaining $100,000,000 was to strengthen the structure of the banks so that they might provide new borrowers with additional credit. Thus it was the expressed intention of Congress to do something to aid the farmers. But by the time the bankers, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Farm Loan Board had engineered the bill through the various committees, it came out as a measure to aid the banks.

To state matters briefly, this $125,000,000 is a sum that is never returnable to the United States Treasury. It is a straight gift to the twelve Federal Land Banks for which the taxpayers get nothing except a bundle of worthless, non-voting, non-profit-sharing stock. Until 1928, though since this year they have been putting their profits into reserves, these banks paid their stockholders annual dividends of 8 and 10 percent. Dividends, now that the banks have been given $125,000,000, may soon be resumed. At any rate the stockholders are clamoring for a resumption of dividends and probably have derived comfort from the fact that Mr. Paul Bestor, Federal Farm Loan Commissioner, has stated that the millions referred to can be used for the purpose of earning them. But dividends are a poor substitute for the farmer-shareholder's land.

Has this fund, or any substantial part of it, been used for its designated purpose? Bluntly speaking, it has not. How could it be, when the Federal Farm Loan Commissioner and Congress were never in accord as to what that purpose was? Congress passed the bill, as one congressman said to Commissioner Bestor, so "that your present policy may be made more lenient," to which Mr. Bestor replied that he didn't "like the use of the word lenient." Neither do the banks. During 1931 they foreclosed on twice as many farmers as they had in 1930, and if one can judge by the protests the farmers have been raising, the present year will see the figures again doubled.

Furthermore, the banks' own statements show that although in the first six months of 1932 they have received not only $125,000,000 from the Treasury, but also an additional $30,000,000 which they borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Federal Land Banks have actually loaned to farmers slightly less than half as much money as they loaned them for the corresponding period of 1931.

What, then, have these banks done with this money? Can it be that these twelve governmentally sponsored financial institutions, borrowing the technique from the Joint Stock Banks as above described, are using for the repurchase of their own bonds the funds given them for the aid of the farmers? That is exactly what they are doing. Their bonds are down, and have been down for some time, to about 87. When the Assistant Farm Loan Commissioner was asked a few weeks ago if the Federal Land Banks were not using the farm-aid fund for the repurchase of their bonds, his reply was affirmative, although he added that he couldn't state the extent to which this was going on until he had received statements from all the banks.

Such a partial statement is now at hand. In a recent letter Mr. Bestor, the Farm Loan Commissioner, states that "during the six-month period ending June 30, the net excess of purchases over sales of farm-loan bonds [by the twelve Federal Land Banks] was $17,927,686.02." This, of course, leaves us still in the dark as to the actual amount so spent. Probably it was quite a few millions more than Mr. Bestor's figure, but in any event the size of the sum is not the point. If any of the funds received from the Treasury have been so applied, the bondholders, who are also the bag-holders, should know about it.

Congress intends that this particular appropriation should be used to maintain farm values. Farm values maintain bond values. Isn't it perfectly obvious that if the bankers can bring down both by withholding credit and by foreclosures, and can thereafter make a handsome profit for themselves by using free taxpayers' money to discount their own obligations, they are very likely to do so? They would hardly be human, and certainly they wouldn't be worthy the name of bankers, if they muffed such a rare opportunity.

It seems to be the unavoidable conclusion that the land-bank system represents an economic blunder. These banks, which depend solely upon farmers for their income, and which pay out their profits during prosperous years to stockholders, cannot possibly be in a position to aid the farmers when they really need it. On the contrary, as they must pay interest on their bonds they also must, whenever any agricultural depression comes along, choose between being delinquent themselves or being hard-boiled with their farmer delinquents. That is the position they are in today. Having used the cry "aid for the farmers" as an appeal, and thereby having obtained aid for themselves, they have now discovered that they are not in such a bad fix after all. Loss to the bondholder of his money, plus loss to the farmers of their lands, means profit to the banks.

OWEN P. WHITE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Waiting for 1936

NO ELEVENTH-HOUR REPENTANCE.—Mr. Hoover's friends are saying that his Des Moines speech did him a great deal of good. They claim that it was a fine speech in itself, and that millions of radio listeners, hearing the applause of the audience, perceived that the President does after all have warm friends and loyal supporters. His enemies point out, first, that the speech contained a series of glaring misstatements of historical fact—notably, his declaration that going off the gold standard would have injured the debtor class; second, that no one was allowed to enter the hall who was not identified as a Hoover sympathizer and that this fact was widely known to the radio audience, especially that in Iowa itself; third, that he devoted most of his time to defending his past record, whereas most people want to know what he proposes to do now; fourth, that his promise regarding the use of war debts to aid the farmer is so vague as to be incomprehensible; and fifth, that Wall Street's commentary on his speech, in the form of the worst market break in a year, gave a sound judgment on its political merits.

This debate is of little importance, however; the shrewdest students of politics seem agreed that practically no votes are changed so late in the campaign as this. By some incredible piece of folly, one candidate or the other might still injure himself, but barring this extremely unlikely event, the whole matter is settled, and was settled long ago. Indeed, some experts who have made a close study of all municipal, state and congressional elections in the past four years hold that a Democratic landslide was clearly indicated as long ago as 1930; and that whatever is the margin of Governor Roosevelt's victory, it would have been about as large, perhaps much larger, with any one of half a dozen other contenders for the nomination (always excepting Al Smith). People are not voting in favor of the Democrats; they are voting against the Republicans.

The Outs have it.—That the Democratic ticket will win now seems beyond any reasonable doubt. Straw votes are not completely reliable, but several of the best ones have in recent elections been wrong by only small percentages. Claude E. Robinson of Columbia University finds in his thoughtful book on "Straw Votes" (The Columbia University Press) that the Hearst newspaper poll was wrong by only 5 percent in 1928; and that the Literary Digest polls of 1924 and 1928 (after being corrected for a 6-percent error in favor of the Republicans, because of the way in which the lists of voters are made up) were wrong by only 6 percent. The Hearst poll in 1932 shows Roosevelt leading by 241 electoral votes, or 386 to Hoover's 145. This tabulation gives Hoover only eleven states—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Kansas and Colorado. In the Literary Digest poll the first twenty states give Hoover only 54 electoral-college votes, and Roosevelt 244. Incidentally, the record available as I write (The Literary Digest presumably holds back some of its ballots in order to prolong the excitement) shows Roosevelt ahead in Colorado, New York and Ohio, all of which are given to Hoover by the Hearst poll. This shift in the electoral-college vote makes Roosevelt the victor by the seemingly incredible figure of 465 to 66.

Maine, as, if and when.—Professor Robinson in his book devotes a whole chapter to Maine as a political barometer, and concludes that it is not a reliable one. In three national elections, for example, those of 1884, '92 and 1916, the state went Republican in September and the country went Democratic in November. From 1856 to 1932 it had *never* gone Democratic in a state election in a presidential year, when there was a clear-cut contest (on five occasions, there was a Fusion candidate representing both parties). Professor Robinson's book, written before the September election of this year, naturally took it for granted that in Maine there is always a Republican plurality of some sort in a local election and argued that its size is not a good guide to the national outcome. That his general contention is sound is indicated by the fact that both the Hearst and Literary Digest polls now give Maine to Hoover, one by 63 percent of the total vote, the other by 55 percent. Nevertheless, the fact that the Democrats captured three out of four important offices in the Maine election, for the first time since the Republican party was created, is undoubtedly significant as showing a nationwide trend.

Hatching the cuckoo's eggs.—This is an election in which party lines are being crossed by thousands of persons. In the Literary Digest poll, 20,000 former Democrats are voting for Hoover, and 153,000 former Republicans are voting for Roosevelt; or to express it another way 6.2 percent of Mr. Hoover's voters are former Democrats, while 37 percent of Mr. Roosevelt's once gave allegiance to the G. O. P. On a basis of the first 700,000 ballots, Norman Thomas, the Socialist candidate, ought to increase his total vote from 267,000 in 1928 to about 2,500,000; it is impossible, of course, to say whether this vote is drawn mainly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from Republican or Democratic ranks. On the same basis of calculation, the Communist candidate, William Z. Foster, ought to poll about a quarter of a million votes, as against 48,000 in 1928.

This crossing of party boundaries has already had some important effects. In Wisconsin, as everyone knows, thousands of progressive Democrats who had been in the habit of voting for the La Follettes in the Republican primaries, this year went home to their own party, on the ground that for the first time in at least sixteen years it was important that good Democratic candidates be chosen. It is possible that some progressive Republicans followed them for the same reason and thus helped contribute to the debacle of the La Follette forces in the primary. It it is not unreasonable to suppose that the same influence may have been at work in other states as well. If so, the jubilant boasts of The Chicago Tribune and other conservative newspapers and individuals, that they have crushed the progressives by their campaigns of red-blooded Americanism, are completely ill founded.

Nevertheless, it is true, as conservative commentators are now gleefully pointing out, that an overwhelming Democratic landslide this year will leave the progressive Republican members of Congress in a difficult position. Some of them will go down in a Republican defeat for which they are the last persons in the world who ought to suffer. Others will find themselves in an increasingly anomalous position as the lines are drawn more clearly between the Republican party and that wing of the Democratic party for which Roosevelt is now spokesman. But this is only one more illustration of the absurdity of American politics.

The Messianic complex.—When one considers the problems by which the United States will be confronted during the next four years, her present plight and that of the world, it seems simply unbelievable that men should come forward blithely and offer to undertake leadership in such a crisis. Yet there are plenty of individuals who have spent large sums of money and expended vast energy in trying to pull down this burden upon their own shoulders—not only the candidates who are now seeking the office, but all those who sought the nomination of one party or another and didn't get it. There is, of course, some excuse for the Socialists and Communists: they think they have a magic formula which would set the world aright; and they know very well that they will not be called upon to put their theories into practice, at least for the present. But consider Mr. Hoover who, having worn the hair shirt for four years, would give both ears to be able to wear it four years longer; or Mr. Roosevelt who, while he would not augment the depression as the Republicans have done with their policies, certainly could do no more to relieve it than the statesmen of England, Germany or France have been able to do.

Now that they've got it.—It is never desirable for an election to be won so overwhelmingly that the opposition fades away into insignificance, as happened in the British election last year and seems at least possible in the United States in November. This is doubly true when the party which wins is without any genuine program or deep sense of inner coherence, which is the case with the Democrats today. Mr. Roosevelt is a man of intellectual ability and a general liberal outlook. His attitude on some matters—power, for instance—is startlingly more advanced than it is in other fields. But his party remains the same old party. North still wars against South, recent immigrant against old Anglo-Saxon, city against country. If he wins as completely as now seems likely, he will interpret the victory as a mandate on behalf of "the Forgotten Man," not in the terms of Norman Thomas, still less of W. Z. Foster, but on the basis of a cross between extremely mild state socialism and, in W. J. Ghent's famous phrase, benevolent feudalism. But his party will continue to be a whirlpool of conflicting elements, few of which have any real sympathy with Governor Roosevelt's position.

Gamblers all.—Mr. Hoover is staking everything on the end of the depression. He has been doing so ever since it began, and has repeatedly made the most terrible blunders by believing, over and over, that it was terminating when it wasn't. But Mr. Roosevelt is also gambling on the end of the depression, in his own way. He obviously believes that it can be weathered without making any serious alteration in the economic structure of our society; that we can pull through by shortening sail and putting a few of the passengers at the pumps. He would only be normally human if he now took it for granted, without thinking carefully about it, that as soon as he is in office, things will get better.

Perhaps they will. But it is only common sense to remember that perhaps they won't. This may be a ten-year depression instead of a three-year one. At present, when we are only 3 percent above the absolute bottom, the cockiness of many thousands of people is not very well founded. If the depression goes on, Mr. Roosevelt will find that his policies are palliatives only. They are very good palliatives, they have worked quite well in England and Germany, but for a sick system of society they are only a shot of adrenalin. In every other industrialized country, we have seen alternate governments of the Right and the Left thrown out with dizzying rapidity when both garages and dinner pails were empty. It is just possible that a Democratic failure during the next four years might bring back a chastened, seemingly rejuvenated Republican party at the next election. But it is also possible that, by then, enough people might have had some hard sense pounded into their heads to make a different outcome possible. . . . Gentlemen, I give you: the New Party of 1936!

BRUCE BLIVEN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MOMENT IN A CHANGING WORLD

Midas

Where he wandered, dream-enwound,
Brightness took the place of sound.
Shining plane and mass before:
Everywhere the sealéd door.
Children's unplacated grace
Met him with an empty face.
Mineral his limbs were grown,
Weight of being, not his own.
Ere he knew that he must die,
Ore had veinéd lip and eye:
Caught him scarcely looking back,
Startled at his golden track,
Immortalized the quickened shade
Of meaning by a moment made.

YVOR WINTERS.

Elegy

The horse that made centaurs of men
Is dead, but the fit hoof that wakened
Dust from an indifferent sleep
Returns as drier dust unslakened.
The sea of death has stilled this wave
That was the wind of a Grecian cave.

So first man felt the lift of wings,
Urgent to outfly the swallow;
This fire that so fleetly flew
Could tempt and make the swift deer follow.
To man on the ancient plain
Was rendered even the spirit's grain.

And when that strong creature had
Endowed mankind beyond his own,
In the long processional
He gave to kings a living throne,
Maintained above the scattering dust
The triumph of the racial thrust.

He shook his flaming crest and rode
In wars, and bore the mind's sword
Upward, flinging a fiery thought
Till Greek and Celt were one accord.
Mountains and valleys he moved to seas,
Fusing their people's destinies.

No more the sagged, reluctant earth
Will break in fire beneath these feet,
Or bending trees will blow the dew
Rhythmic to the flank's warm beat,
As Pegasus once raced the day
Down the long white, winding way.

The stripling long befriended has
Betrayed his tutor. Now he swarms
In mimic steeds of steel the earth
And air beyond the range of storms.
This fruit of a million years a breath
Has shaken down to fraudulent death.

HELEN CORNELIUS.

The Difference

Day after day, for her, the sun
Drew semicircles smooth and high.
A week was seven domes across a desert,
And any afternoon took long to die—
Rounding the great curve downward not too fast,
Not falling; not a shadow ran awry.

His day was two thin lightning lines
Pitched here one instant like a tent;
Then night; and there was neither afternoon
Nor evening to be witness how they went.
His day was but a burning at the top;
Then the steep fall, and every spark was spent.

They lived together only thus:
One tick of noon their common day;
And many a noon, so meeting, each would ask:
What found the other past the middle way?
But neither he whose leap was like a star
Nor she who curved and swung could ever say.

MARK VAN DOREN.

Transfigured Swan

A start—
And the rich dart
Blossoms in the unripened heart.

At last
There is no rest
For the long locked and over-rounded breast.

No blood
Stains the ecstatic moment, but a flood
Of mounting gratitude.

And the one choice
Of a delivered voice
Is to rejoice.

Of the disdains,
The frozen dreams, the unresponsive pains,
Nothing remains.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And of the wound,
Widening and unbound,
There is no sound.

Praise, only praise,
Extends the throat, invents a hundred ways
To lift the swelling phrase.

Till, like an overtone of prayer, the long
Echoes are everywhere,
And the loose air
Is stretched and strong.

Nothing remains of wrong.
Nothing but song.

LOUIS UNTERMEYER.

Recollection of the Wood

Light at each point was beating then to flight,
The sapling bark flushed upward, and the welling
Tips of the wood touched, touched at the bound,
And boughs were slight and burdened beyond telling
Toward that caress of the boughs a summer's night,
Illimitable in fragrance and in sound.

Here were the blue buds, earlier than hope,
Unnumbered, beneath the leaves, a breath apart,
Wakening in root-dusk. When the air went north,
Lifting the oakleaves from the northern slope,
Their infinite young tender eyes looked forth.
And all that was, was frail to bear a heart.

LEONIE ADAMS.

The Cage

Be still, O Mind, in your cage!
All day I feel your angry feet
Pace up and down, and then repeat
All night in dreams your rage.

The bars that are your pain
Are dark as night, and never yet
Their strength has prisoner beset
And not beset in vain.

Their insubstantial steel
Has less weight than a summer's snow,
Yet is too strong to overthrow,
Too dense to reveal

The mysteries beyond.
The barriers of sense are high,
And who escapes—until he die—
Their immemorial bond?

And who may overleap
The wall of birth to say what land
Rolls backward from the darkling strand
Of oceans in their sleep?

Or who surmount the wall
That has no gate save through the ground,
That beaten on gives back no sound,
That passed knows no recall?

O pitiful, be glad!
Look not past Eden lest you see
The Hand that played so cruelly
With dust, its frail comrade.

Shout down your walls! A star
Flames in the water of this cup!
A white wave breaks! The moon is up!
The season sings, and far

And wide, and left and right,
Springs tramples Heaven, tramples Hell—
Knowing them tales the dreamers tell—
And vanishes in light!

HAROLD LEWIS COOK.

Absolute Benison

Those who delighted feast on difference,
Measuring the larkspur head-higher than the rose,
Can find no benison in burials,
The only absolute that summer knows.

But those who weary of this variance,
Which only an impertinence can name,
Weary of matching petal with pale petal
To find them similar but not the same,

Turn with nostalgia to that darkened garden
Where all eternal replicas are kept,
And the first rose and the first lark's song
Since the first spring have slept.

MARGARET MEAD.

1932

Quiet the chattering of the looms and spin
No further stuff to dress our bodies in.
Leave to the nugget iron the tempered thews
Of bridges we have little need to use.
Let neither fire nor water turn a wheel
For power to carry words we cannot feel.
Let the corn fall ungathered, since no grain
Can feed the biting hunger of the brain.
Let no deep-rooted, quick-leaved trees be split
To wall the wasted region where we sit.
Let us go naked, with an air of doom
About the street, the meeting place, the room;
Subsist on dust and leaves and feel beneath
Our feet the stones, the intimates of death.

RAYMOND HOLDEN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lifting the Farmers Out of the Mud

ROAD BUILDING in America has passed into a new stage. Arterial highways, which heretofore have been our chief concern, are to yield their position of first importance, and secondary roads, farm-to-market roads, are to replace them as a major engineering undertaking of the nation.

Here in America in a decade and a half we ran our road bill to a billion and a half dollars a year. We thought we had settled into our stride. We thought we knew what we wanted in roads and how to get it. We concluded we must have an unbroken slab of pavement that would endure to the end of time. Such was our standard and we would live up to it.

But there was a certain exasperating ant in the molasses. These roads were back-breakingly expensive. In Pennsylvania they cost us $50,000 to $70,000 a mile. We spent as much as $85,000,000 a year to build them. Even where resources shamed Croesus there was a physical limit to the mileage that could be built on this basis. And while we got certain arterial highways people in the country stayed in the mud.

Several states decided the time was ripe to get roads to areas where traffic did not call for a boulevard that cost $60,000 a mile. Foremost were Pennsylvania, Virginia and North Carolina. Pennsylvania decided to develop the possibilities of so modest a sum as $6,000 a mile, or even less.

In the spring of 1931, 80,000 miles of Pennsylvania roads were the responsibility of the townships, against 13,425 miles in charge of the state. Township roads have great local importance. They offer short connections between state highways, give outlets to villages and communities, provide the farmer with roads to market and to school and church, make the doctor available at all times of year, bring trade to wholesale and retail merchants, facilitate the transit of manufactured articles, relieve congestion on the main highways, give access to the great outdoor playgrounds of the state and allow hunters and fishermen to reach their objectives.

Part of the hard luck of the farmer everywhere comes from his difficulty in getting his product from his factory, which is the farm, to his market. Cheap and continuous transportation is even more important to the producer of milk than to the manufacturer of steel because milk is quickly perishable. For all these reasons it was imperative that something be done for those who live on the back roads.

Today Pennsylvania is building all-weather highways that cost six thousand dollars a mile or less. Assumption of responsibility for local roads is no less a new venture in state government than the huge experiment in low-cost roads. Road builders of the nation are watching what promises to be the beginning of a new era in road building.

And that new era came through a mandate of the people. It was necessary that the legislature transfer rural roads to state jurisdiction. I suggested the proposed transfer and made it a plank in my platform when I ran for Governor in 1930. For many years I have traveled into every section of the state. I knew how hard it was to get back to the people living on farms, and how much more trying it must be for them to wrestle all the time with the problem of miserable roads.

Rural roads are under the care of supervisors who, obviously, are not professional road builders. Sufficient money cannot be raised to improve all the highways a township needs. The state, I argued, should take over twenty thousand miles and transform them into dustless, mudless, hard-surfaced thoroughfares good every day in the year—and maintain the entire mileage.

My political opponents said this proposal made them laugh. They declared so gigantic an improvement program was impossible. Unwound on the map of the nation, the ribbon of proposed new road would reach from New York to Seattle, back to Philadelphia, across to San Francisco, slope down from the Lincoln Highway to Norfolk, cut by the Santa Fe Trail to Los Angeles, through the South to New Orleans, and double back all the way to Mexico City. Pennsylvania was already collecting more money for roads than any other state. Here was a proposal that it take over a burden always regarded as that of the local community. The thing was declared to be too ridiculous for consideration.

But the people approved the proposal and elected me. They gave me a legislature that without a dissenting vote transferred 20,000 miles of dirt road from the counties and townships to the state system. In the history of Pennsylvania or any other state it will be hard to find a legislative proposal more heartily supported, although it thrust on the state a huge expense that had previously fallen elsewhere.

Legislators from rural sections might have been expected to support it, for even though maintenance was ineffective, the roads taken over by the state were costing them $10,000,000 a year. But representatives of metropolitan sections supported the measure with equal enthusiasm. Senators and assemblymen agreed that good roads to farms would be a profitable investment.

Authorities had been in agreement for years as to durably paved main roads. Pennsylvania spent

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hundreds of millions to build them. They constituted its arterial system—the roads carrying heavy traffic between centers of population. But now the main roads were nearly all improved. And clinging to the notion that only high-cost pavement should be built, the state frequently put down fifty-thousand-dollar-a-mile roads where they were not needed. In use for years, travel on them was so light that the pavement lacked the customary dark stripe made by oil dropped by traffic. The money spent on every twenty miles of such pavement would have brought a satisfactory surface to one or two hundred miles of purely rural roads.

We studied cheaper roads for lighter traffic and found that where old roadbeds had adequate bases, we could put on a layer of broken-stone aggregate, treat it with a bituminous binder and, at a cost ranging from $1,500 to $2,500 a mile, get a satisfactory surface. It could be built upon as it tended to break down, and would improve with the years. In the eastern part of the state we found that where the New Jersey gravels were encountered, hard surface roads could be built cheaply without the introduction of outside materials, simply by using a bituminous binder. We learned that in Massachusetts and Florida native sands are being bound in the same way and satisfactory light-traffic roads established.

In Pennsylvania, however, few native earths can be built into satisfactory roads. In most cases prepared stone must be brought to the highway. This material, however, can usually be found not far away. This utilization of local material is a feature of all such road building.

As our studies proceeded we adopted a type of road that serves our purposes admirably. By no means is it the cheapest possible type. It is a substantial structure which the engineers say can be built up to carry almost any weight of traffic. On these rural roads the maximum of $6,000 a mile is all that may go into them. Often we cut $1,000 from that figure.

Not to go too much into engineering detail, here is what we get for less than $6,000. We insist, first, upon a roadbed that is twenty feet wide. This necessitates clearing out, widening and easing of curves and grades. Then comes drainage. The impassibility of many country roads comes from lack of drainage. The breaking down of many improved roads is due to the same cause. Hard-surfaced roads go to pieces when water stands alongside them, or soaks into their foundation. Our point of attack after establishing the right of way, therefore, is drainage. The purchase at one time of $500,000 worth of drain pipe is evidence of the attention we gave to this feature.

In the center of our twenty-foot width we build a road fourteen to sixteen feet wide. Thus we always have the foundation for a wider road if and when the need develops. This width is sufficient for cars to pass where the traffic is light.

In Pennsylvania, as I have said, the base course is usually local stone. Sometimes we tear down stone fences all along old highways and work them into our foundations. Farmers haul to the roadway the piles of stone they have gathered for decades from their fields and we use them. We draw upon rock formations along the right of way. We buy crushed quarry stone where necessary. Slag makes good road material. "Red dog," a bricklike material which results from the burning of refuse culm heaps, is excellent.

Base materials are put down in varying degrees of thickness, depending on the need. In low places with soft bottoms the base may be nearly a foot thick. Or the road may pass over a limestone ridge, and no base is needed. Generally, however, we build a broken-stone base five inches thick. It is thoroughly compacted by a steam roller before the next course is added.

This is a three to four-inch application of a finer material, usually three-quarter-inch stone. To this surface, finally, a bituminous binding material is applied. It is customary to speak of it as "oil," but it is either tar, a by-product of coke, or asphalt refined from certain types of crude oil. Asphalt is thinned with gasoline until sufficiently liquid for easy application. The gasoline evaporates after the asphalt is applied. A second application may come later, with a sprinkling of stone chips which form a non-skid surface.

Thus the typical Pennsylvania rural road is completed. It differs from the more costly type of pavement in that its heaviest repair is likely to come in the first few years. It may ravel a bit. Depressions and bumps may come. These are readily mended. New applications of oil and stone chips are made, and the rough places ironed out. The substantial base can be built upon indefinitely. The surface can be widened to the full twenty feet. Additional surface courses will carry heavy traffic if the necessity arises and the new roads can be developed into more substantial types.

We were ready to go to work before the 20,000 miles of township roads were turned over to us on August 15, 1931. In fact we began the first section on July 23, at Smith's Grove, in York County. The highway serves a very old Quaker community and connects Lewisberry, on an improved road with Rossville, five miles away. More than a hundred years old, it was often so muddy that it could be traveled only on horseback. At each end is a Quaker meeting house, that at Rossville carrying the date of 1769. The ancient Quakers convened for worship one Sunday at one end of the road and the next Sunday at the other. Smith's Grove is halfway between and here was a wide, straight stretch of dirt on which the younger Quakers are said to have tested the speed of their horses.

At Smith's Grove we broke ground for our huge and statewide task of construction. Barns and fences thereabouts had been freshly painted.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wherever we build these roads fences are likely immediately to be renewed, farms cleaned up and new activities, including the coming to life of abandoned farms, inaugurated. Evidence of public interest in the program was shown when five thousand people came to the ceremony.

We promised to complete as much as possible of our 20,000 miles in four years and maintain every foot of it. This means an expenditure of more than $120,000,000. The sum seems stupendous. But it is quite within the means of so rich a state as Pennsylvania. Here the gasoline tax totals $33,000,000 a year and the automobile license $31,000,000 more. My predecessor spent much more than that on limited mileages of high-cost road. He spent so liberally, in fact, that the road treasury was quite empty when I took office.

In August we decided that we could build 1,700 miles of road before the ground froze in November. That meant a modest $10,000,000 to get the work started in every county. It was 8½ percent of the program, and that percentage of each county's road was selected for improvement. Immediately we were buying and renting machinery, wherever we could, and getting under way.

The magnitude of the task is evident when it is known that we spent $1,500,000 for purchase of equipment, and as much more for rentals, though we go light on machines and do as much work as possible with man power. Six hundred carloads of culvert pipe came rolling in while 2,500 tank cars of asphalt and 150,000 carloads of coarse aggregate were delivered to us.

The program provided employment for the needy. We distributed the work, giving men with families the preference. Construction was by the state direct, rather than through contract. The number of workers on our rolls increased rapidly. The November frosts failed to materialize, so we added another 666 miles of road to the program. By December we had 28,000 people working on the roads. By January 30,000. The unusual mildness enabled us to keep going all winter.

And we kept going all summer, too—and are still going. We shall keep going through the coming winter, so far as weather will permit. In late September our highway department had 40,000 men at work—twice as many as any other state. Since August 15, 1931, the department has finished 3,950 miles of the rural roads. And we are proud of the accomplishment. So, too, are the thousands of men and women who live along those roads.

If I may pause to brag a bit, I point to the fact that here in Pennsylvania we have over 34,000 miles of highway under care of the state. The huge state of Texas has only 20,000 miles of state highway and our wealthy neighbor, New York, less than that mileage. No other state has ever approached our program. We challenge them all to do as we have done, to come along with Pennsylvania in a real, concerted effort to lift the farmer out of the mud.

GIFFORD PINCHOT.

Washington Notes

Farley's Landslide—Shaking Down the Republicans—Herbert Afire—Winning the East
The Old Potato Handshake

THERE seems to be a feeling among the calmer minds on the Democratic side that there is such a thing as overclaiming in a presidential campaign. For the past month or so, apparently, the whole Democratic strategy has been to drive home the idea that a landslide for the Roosevelt-Garner ticket is inevitable. To this end the somewhat blatant Mr. Farley evolved a ballyhoo based on the idea that Roosevelt will have a ten-million majority and that every state in the Union will be carried by Democratic candidates. This ballyhoo has been broadcast from coast to coast and is still being echoed by every Democratic radio crooner and stump speaker.

The presidential candidate, Mr. Roosevelt, gayly plays up to his national chairman by constantly referring to his election as a foregone conclusion and consistently talking about what he will do when he is in the White House, with never a qualifying "if" in his vocabulary. And Mr. Garner, his cautious running mate, who will hold on to one job even if he misses the other, sings in the same key.

No doubt all of this has done the Democratic cause some good. Unquestionably there is a large band-wagon vote in the country and the way to corral it is to pretend supreme confidence. None the less, the thing can be overdone and in this campaign there are those who think that to some extent it had been. They are still of the opinion that the Democratic chances are better than a fifty-fifty bet and they by no means decry the manifest advantages of stiffening the party morale and heartening the Democratic hosts with the promise of victory. What they do say is that to go as far as the Farley boys have been going may have certain effects which will offset the advantages. As the campaign swings into its final phase some of these are beginning to be apparent.

Beyond question one of them is the stimulation of Republican campaign contributions. I am revealing no secret when I say that the Republican quota of a million and a half dollars, announced last August as the goal of the Finance Committee, has been oversubscribed. In the past three weeks there has been no difficulty at all, I am told by those in position to know, in getting money for the Hoover-Curtis cause. Partly this has been owing to the fright thrown into the Eastern "business interests" by the fraternizing of Mr. Roosevelt with Senators George Norris of Nebraska and Hiram Johnson of California. The name of Norris is more abhorrent to the conservative Eastern banker and business man than any other in public life. He is regarded by them—and properly so—as the most potent and effective foe of the swollen fortune and the vested interest in the country. His ringing endorsement of Roosevelt and the Roosevelt eulogy of him were quite enough to make many a tight-fisted Republican reactionary in the East loosen up.

Joseph R. Nutt, the pious treasurer of the Republican National Committee, reported vastly increased collections

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

following the return of Roosevelt from the West. Up to the first of October Mr. Nutt had had a pretty hard and thankless job. From that date on things have been relatively easy and I am told that his cherubic face has been wreathed in smiles. By the real managers of the Republican campaign—and I do not mean Mr. Everett Sanders, the chairman, or Mr. Lucas, the vice-chairman, or Senator Fess, or Senator Hebert, or even the charming ex-Senator Henry Allen of Kansas, but the real managers who stay here in Washington and are generally to be found in the White House—by these real managers the flood of party contributions is attributed partly to the prominence recently given to the so-called radical influences in Mr. Roosevelt's camp and partly to the feeling that Mr. Farley's claims were so out of proportion to the possibilities that it might easily be true that he had no real foundation for them.

A second result of overclaiming on the part of the Democratic management, as I think I pointed out here a week or so ago, has been to stir Mr. Hoover into an activity he had not previously planned. It drove him into his Des Moines speech, which concededly did him a measurable amount of good in the agricultural sections, and it was also responsible for getting Mr. Coolidge to say something in favor of the administration without being paid for it.

It was Mr. Hoover's intention to make only one speech in this campaign and that was the one he made on August 11 in accepting the nomination. It was Mr. Coolidge's idea to make no speech whatever. He wrote his Saturday Evening Post article in August and thought that was all that was needed from him and all that should be required. The tremendous steam behind the Democratic campaign, the earnestness and sincerity with which Mr. Farley made his claims, the fact that the candidate took it for granted that he was to be the next President, and the shock of the Maine election, caused a complete change in the Republican attitude.

What Mr. Farley and Governor Roosevelt succeeded in doing, among other things, was to convince Mr. Hoover and everybody with the smallest stake in the Republican party that the fight was a desperate one, that it could not be won without going to extreme lengths, that every resource in sight had to be called upon and that there was yet time to save the situation if nothing was left undone.

I do not contend that the tide which has been clearly Democratic for the past two years has been turned or even checked. I do not mean that it is not still possible that Mr. Hoover will be overwhelmingly beaten and that the landslide so confidently ballyhooed by the blatant Farley will not materialize. What I do contend is that it is one of those things of which no man will be really certain until the ballots are counted on the night of November 8, and that within the last few days the Republican effort has been intelligently intensified in the big pivotal states East, West and Middle West.

What I really want to point out is that despite the multiplicity of signs which indicate that the people are all set for a change and that nothing can save the Hoover administration from defeat, there have been such signs and indications once or twice before without fulfilment. It is perhaps still true that if the election were held today the Democrats would win, and the present odds of seven to five seem to me fairly well justified. However, it is at least possible that a shift may come in the important states within the next three weeks.

Hoover's trip to Iowa, Coolidge's speech in New York City and the nomination of the Donovan-Davison ticket in New York State have combined, rightly or wrongly, to give the Hooverians considerable more courage than they had this time last week. They think they have the better of the situation in New York, despite The Literary Digest, and that before election day, Iowa, Kansas, California, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan and Minnesota can be brought back to their Republican moorings. Upon these states their efforts will be concentrated. It is not, I am told, proposed to bother with Missouri, Kentucky or Tennessee. The really weak spot in the Republican calculations is the state of Illinois. As things stand today, the word comes to Washington that Illinois is lost to the Hoover cause. Inasmuch as next to New York and Pensylvania, Illinois has more electoral votes than any other, this situation is of no little concern to the White House circle.

On the Democratic side, the public handshaking between Smith and Roosevelt, the nomination of Lehman for Governor and the continued trend toward the Democrats in the polls have kept confidence up to the high-water mark. However, every once in a while a tremor of apprehension seizes upon the more level-headed of the Roosevelt advisory council. Mr. Farley, in putting out his claim of forty-eight states for Roosevelt, frequently tells the newspaper boys that it looks almost too good to be true. There are some pessimistic fellows among them who say the reason it looks that way is because it isn't true. Who can tell?

Washington. T. R. B.

Screen Version

NOT LONG ago, apropos of the film version of Eugene O'Neill's "Strange Interlude," I wrote an article in which I said that so far as I knew, the moving pictures had not yet turned out a play of significance, that even when the play on which the film was based had been of some importance, the screen result had not. I said also that the talkies had, temporarily at least, given a setback to the moving-picture problem; though necessary and inevitable, the addition of speech to this art has delayed its discovery of what the qualities are by which it is separate to itself, an art distinct from all other arts. The article has brought in a letter in which the good points, confusions of theory and looseness of terms with regard to this pressing and confused art seem to me so typical of most moving-picture discussions as to invite a reply.

Dear Sir:

In a recent article on plays and the moving picture Mr. Stark Young stated that he had never seen a film in which the play was really important. But in the earlier part of his article he said that the final test of any artist is the "singular and pure" expression in terms of his art. If, as is generally agreed, the art of the moving picture is different from that of the theatre, how then can Mr. Young expect to find the same expression for both? Perhaps he is forgetting that the talking picture is of recent birth in comparison to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

silent film. Perhaps he is also forgetting that the medium of the motion picture is not the human being but the camera, which imposes its own world of rhythms, forms and tones upon the spectator through motion recorded on celluloid strips. Of course films and plays both use acting as a means of expression, but a play is expression through direct contact with an audience and a film is mechanical and indirect contact. Consequently, to expect a film to be a good play would be to expect the film to be an imitative and completely false medium.

It is perhaps unfortunate that Mr. Young stresses the significance of good theatre in the films. Drama in a film is essential as well as character, but a scenario is and should always be different from a play because the medium of the camera is first pictorial and only secondarily dramatic. There are a good many people well trained in the theatre who apply the same standards in judging films as they do in the theatre. There are also an astounding number of people who think they can judge films without knowing the first thing about them. Among these may be numbered the majority of our newspaper film critics. This is partially due to the lack of good books of film esthetics and technique, and of course to the fact that the average Hollywooden product is worthy of no better critic than the average man.

The remedy for such a situation would be the establishment of a repertory theatre where the best films of all countries could be shown under competent guidance. Furthermore, courses in the history of the cinema, such as the New School for Social Research is giving this year, should be established. Institutes of Cinematography, such as the one started at the University of Southern California, should be founded in other universities and schools. Practical training for those professionally interested should be made available where the best technicians and directors could instruct in institutions similar to the Russian cinema universities. Of course the most desirable step would be the creation of independent production units away from Hollywood, similar to the Theatre Guild. Such activities would in some degree counteract the commercial Hollywooden product and would help to raise the integrity of the film medium. For certainly the film has not yet come into its own in this country. Nor will it do so unless artists and critics recognize it first as an art form and then as one with its own conditions of expression completely different from those of the theatre.

Nancy Naumburg.

I did say that the first test of any artist in any art is that all he expresses is expressed in terms, singular and pure, of the art he works in, and that this, of course, is an esthetic platitude. I did not say that I expected to find the same expression for both film and theatre. But these points we need not stay on.

The argument in this letter breaks down through making a "film" the parallel of a "play." The art of the drama and the art of the theatre are two different things. A film is not parallel to a play but to an instance of the theatre art, a production seen on the stage, consisting of its several mediums—the play, the acting, the scene (with its settings, lights and costumes) plus, if you like, the audience and music, when there is music. Instead of the medium of actual presence (of scenes and actors) the film employs the medium of the camera. The camera we see on the screen is as much a medium as the actor-scene presence we see on the stage. If this were not so, we should have to regard the film as only a photograph of the acting and scenery, which would be to deny its claims as a separate and distinct form of art. The instance of theatre art—not the "play," which is only a part of it—is, as Miss Naumburg says, "expression through direct contact with an audience"; so far as the film is an art at all, it also is. Only when the film is not an art is its contact with the audience "mechanical and indirect." Within this film medium (complete in itself) its contributing elements (mediums in themselves, the play, the acting, the décor) must find their terms of expression, as they have done already, more or less, in the theatre. There is no such thing in art as an indirect medium. The point at the moment, however, involves neither the play nor the theatre art. The point is that the relation, in the film, of the actor and the scene to the whole, is different from the relation, in the theatre art, of the actor and the scene to the whole. With that straight we can go on with the subject.

In both the art of the film and the art of the theatre the play takes its place as a part of the whole, in a proportion that varies according to the case, sometimes more acting or more scenery and less play, sometimes vice versa. I was speaking not of the theatre but of the play as a part of the film.

The contrast is not between "pictorial" and "dramatic." It is between camera and actual presence (scene and actors.) Obviously it would be only stupid to judge a moving picture and a theatrical production as if they were both the same art; we are dealing with two mediums, not with one. But this affects only the medium in which the play appears, it has nothing to do with "standards" of judgment.

As to Miss Naumburg's comment on the average film critics, the error lies in thinking them worse than the average critic in any other art. They would be equally bad critics of the theatre. The average critic merely tells us what sort of a time he had, or at least observed the people around him having, which is one way of judging. He has no knowledge, in the first place, of the fact that every art employs its own language, into which the material it employs must be translated before we have art at all. Looking at acting, for example, he watches for what seems natural, or something of that sort, and is blind to the fact that it is only when the actor's self and the character and the actions have been restated in acting terms that we have any acting at all. You will notice that he will applaud a facile, lively piece of self-excitement or exhibited self in the actor (which in a sense is right, since the element of personality is a main element in acting). You will notice him applaud stunts, places where the performer is going off into mere skill (and there also in a sense he is right, since art, or at least technique, is admitted). But you will see him less certain about the combination of these two, some performance in which the actor regulates his personality to his role and by his art separates himself from purely naturalistic imitation. In sum, not only every art, but every style in that art, has its language, and the average critic nowadays knows only one: the language of the most

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obvious realistic imitation or type-cast reproduction. How many critics, movie or theatre, know anything about music or ever hear it? As if music were not the prime basis of all film and all theatre art, which begins with the dance (the basis of the actor's gesture and stage line) and proceeds onward to the spoken words and to the rhythm of emotions and dramatic emphasis, the pause and forward movement, throughout the whole occasion!

Concerning schools, lectures, guilds, institutions and esthetic treatises as means of solving the problems and providing the understanding and remedies for the film art, I can only agree with Miss Naumburg by saying that the same is true of all our arts.

As for the film's not having come into its own in this country, I am not sure what we are to mean. We are not speaking of the popular arrivals, surely. It may be true that music, literature and even the theatre are taken more seriously than the films are and by people of somewhat superior culture or approach. But as to ubiquity, patronage, fans and popularity, the films left the theatre behind years ago; and the stage in fact has drawn fewer as the moving picture drew more, though it cannot be said that the theatre gets much less patronage than it deserves. It compares, indeed, none too favorably with what it was seven or eight years ago. As for the film's coming into its own artistically, we have had, these past few years, moments in our theatre—Miss Pauline Lord in the first act of "Mariners," Miss Dorothy Stickney as the cracked charwoman in "Chicago," the highly perfected rapport in comedy scenes of Mr. Alfred Lunt and Miss Lynn Fontanne, for example—that have been remarkable.

But there have been moments in the films, meanwhile, quite as good as any of these. There has been, moreover, in the film an artist who surpasses all these. In pure abstraction as regards movement and characterization, in poetry, security and myth, Charlie Chaplin has left the whole theatre far behind him and has created the one thing, in film or theatre, that has gone from America all over the world. It is of course obvious that the film has not come into its own in possibility of expression, in purity of medium and in the definition of its terms as an art.

With Miss Naumburg's last sentence I cannot agree. The film art, certainly, must be, as she says it is, a distinct art form. But its "conditions of expression" are not "completely different from those of the theatre." On the contrary it is exactly the overlapping in the elements that compose the theatre and the film that has made it so hard for both creators of films, as well as the critics and the public, to determine just what are the elements by which the film is an art distinct to itself.

Those overlapping elements appear in other arts besides the theatre and film. Literature and painting and sculpture with regard to narrative, for example, afford a situation that causes no end of misplaced judgment. A picture may be admired for the story told in it, which, though legitimate enough to the painter's art, has not in the particular picture been translated into painting terms. A statue that has diverse painting values to be admired may yet not be sculpture at all in any basic sense. Music and architecture alone among the arts are spared this misplacement: each of these we read in its own terms. To go on with our point about the film and theatre, it is highly likely that some of the most admired moments, or scenes, in the films have arrived not through any translation into the art involved or any essentially film quality, but rather in spite of the film. They were largely mere records of stage events, ordinary photographs of extraordinary matter.

We may note that it is also rendered harder for the film to determine the full nature of its medium by the fact that realism prevails. The freedom, varieties of stylization and so on possible to the camera are hampered by the prejudice just now for naturalistic methods and effects. Release from such limitations appears now and again on the screen, especially in the most notable German films; but for the most part the film—as does the theatre art—limits its attitude, its acting, scene and mood to the likeness and habit of prose actualities.

What I said, however, as to the low grade of the play to be found in most films, has less to do with the medium than with the Hollywood mentality and intentions. The American public whose wants it caters to, imagines, prostitutes or satisfies, is another matter, as are the plays it acquires, emasculates or emboldens, sweetens, trims and highlights. As for the advertising, those signs, capital letters and verbal wonders accorded by Hollywood to its varied productions, the total effect is strangely uniform, indiscriminate and rattled; Tiberius Caesar called Apion the orator the *cymbalum mundi,* which, now freely rendered, means "the brass band of the world."

STARK YOUNG.

Contra Ernest Newman

MR. B. H. Haggin recently gave a radio talk on music from WEVD including some unfavorable comments upon myself and my musical criticism. I learned of them through the kindness of Mr. B. H. Haggin, for he sent me a copy of his speech. Thus, I read:

> Rosenfeld has been engaged all these years in overestimating the second and third-rate pioneers of our own time, and this, I think, in order to raise himself in the estimation of others. Ordinarily, one does not speak of motives; and I am not questioning the honesty of his intentions when I speak of a pose, in the sense of a determination to appear comprehending and sensitive to everything new, which is evident in the very manner, the mannered manner, of his writing, and in the pretense of discerning in a piece of music what is not there.

In the course of his harangue, designed, I imagine, to encourage the public to trust its own unfavorable impressions of certain new kinds of music, or at least not to defer to those "critics" who insist that they hear beauties where the majority hears ugliness, Mr. Haggin made use of some arguments supplied him by the veteran British critic, Mr. Ernest Newman, in his book "A Music Critic's Holiday." In one place, Mr. Haggin quoted approvingly: "The average intelligent musical man . . . is perfectly competent to decide upon the esthetic value of this or that work." In another, he stated that "Newman had demonstrated quite conclusively that the world had never failed to recognize a great composer when it had heard one; and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the presumption from this, he had argued, was against its failing to recognize one today. . . . If most people don't think much of Schoenberg, there is better ground for believing he isn't much than for assuming that something that has never before happened in the history of music has happened now—that thousands of men who, in other cases, knew quite well good music from bad, are in this case wrong, and one or two men alone are right."

Now, the conclusions of Mr. Newman cited by Mr. Haggin are really offensive. The interpretations of past experience on which they are based are demonstrably fallacious; still, they place in the hands of persons bewildered by the new idiom a plausible excuse for closing their minds to a deal of good contemporary music. For Mr. Newman is clothed with an authority derived from the composition of many excellent pieces of musical criticism. We are all indebted to him for his defense of program music, and for his essay on "Berlioz, Romantic and Classic." To be sure, like the rest of us, Mr. Newman is not free of a tendency to error. If I remember correctly, it revealed its presence in himself as early as 1905 or so, when he cast the Strauss of "Don Quixote," "Sinfonia Domestica" and "Salomé" overboard in favor of the Strauss of "Don Juan" and "Tod und Verklärung." Not so long since, he proclaimed the egoism of the author of "Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg." Still, he remains a most effective writer, and his contention that the world has never failed to recognize the greatness of a composer during his lifetime, and that those composers the present world does not call great are therefore presumably of very minor consequence, naturally bears weight. It has already misled Mr. Haggin. It might conceivably mislead others.

Without doubt, Mr. Newman is correct in contending that the legend of the "misunderstood genius" has been outrageously overdone; as far as music is concerned, in any case. All the great and lesser composers have had contemporary recognition; like Stravinsky and Schoenberg in our day. In lucky instances, the number of their devotees has included potentates and grand seigneurs, like Augustus the Strong, Ludwig of Bavaria, Archduke Rudolph and Prince Lichnowsky. In others, they have been composed of rather more obscure and resourceless persons. But to conclude that the numbers of these adherents were to be counted in thousands, and that the full measure of their geniuses were taken by hordes of their contemporaries, is impermissible; for the reason that to do so is to attribute to humanity a devilishness and impiety far greater than we have any right to ascribe to it. To hold that the grandeur of J. S. Bach was fully appreciated by his contemporaries, is to conceive of the pupils of the Thomas-Schule, who after his death used his unpublished manuscripts as kindling-paper, as fiends in human forms. It is to conceive that Mattheson, the foremost German music critic of the eighteenth century, was a deliberate liar when he wrote that P. E. Bach was a better composer than his great father. It is to presume that Devrient and Mendelssohn, who resurrected the St. Matthew-Passion around 1820, were swindlers when they said that it took an actor and a Jew to reveal to the ignorant musical world what is possessed in the cantor's compositions.

To believe that thousands of his contemporaries recognized the full beauty of Mozart's work, and at the same time to know that not one of them went out to Schoenbrünn to beg a living from Joseph II for him, or kept his body from being thrown into an unmarked pauper's grave, is to ascribe to them a monstrous brutality and ingratitude. And to suppose that the professors who used to tell us that Beethoven's last style represented eccentricity, truly understood the last quartets, is to impute to our collegiate faculties degrees of perversity far greater than any we have good cause to imagine them to possess.

No: there is but one reasonable explanation for these mistakes. And that is, that the full measure of the old masters' geniality was taken by few of their contemporaries, and by not an overwhelming number of their successors. Hence, Mr. Newman's contention that the lack of popularity is a valid sign of mediocrity, falls noisily to the ground.

But I have not given all of Mr. Newman's argument, as Mr. Haggin transmits it. He also argues that "he could find no instance in the past of a new music as far removed from the understanding of the period as a book in an unfamiliar language like Chinese would be." Now, I do not know whether the man on the street finds Schoenberg like a book in an unfamiliar language. I rather suspect that he thinks him ugly and dull. But this is precisely what many contemporaries of Wagner found his music. Mr. Newman says that the opposition to Wagner came largely from "critics, musicians and directors of the court opera houses." Yes, but much of this opposition, while possibly inspired by jealousy, based itself on the fact that Wagner's music sounded bad. Professor Bischoff of Cologne, for instance, mocked Wagner's pamphlet, "The Music of the Future," on the ground that he thought Wagner was pretending that the course of time could make something which sounded bad sound well. Nor was this opinion confined to the critics. It was reflected in those clear mirrors of the man in the street, the comic papers. At the time of the "Tannhaüser" performance in Paris, a French comic published a cartoon representing a mother addressing her daughter, who is playing the piano. The legend beneath it runs, "My child, you are striking nothing but false notes." "Oh, mama, these aren't false notes. This is 'Tannhaüser.' "

But for the sake of argument, let us grant all Mr. Newman's premises. Let us grant that never before in history has new music sounded to the public like Chinese. For the fact that it now does, proves exactly nothing about the value of Stravinsky, Hindemith, Schoenberg and the other radicals. We know that many ways of thinking and conceptions of reality which have seemed mad and abhorrent to the public have none the less proved themselves perfectly lucid and agreeable to future generations. Exactly nine copies of the first edition of "Also Sprach Zarathustra" were sold; yet Thomas Mann recently wrote that practically everything live in modern thought takes its direction from Nietzsche. At the time that the greatest revolution in music, according to Mr. Newman, the invention of the music-drama, was being completed in Florence, they were burning at the stake in Rome the prophet of science and democracy, Giordano Bruno. And while Schoenberg may not be in danger of "relaxation," who of us can say whether art may not be offering a pregnant new way of thinking and conception of reality to the world?

PAUL ROSENFELD.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

Everybody's Right, Everybody's Wrong!

SIR: After listening to the censures, remonstrances, philippics, diatribes and strictures of, by and upon the various political parties—the Republicans against the Democrats, the Democrats against the Republicans, the Socialists against both, the Communists against all three, and the world against the Communists—I am willing to agree that everybody who says that everybody's wrong is right.

All parties have egregiously disgraced themselves and befouled one another. It is the clear duty of every voter to cast a protest vote. I therefore suggest:

1. That everybody who voted for Hoover in 1928 vote for Roosevelt;
2. That all the 1928 Democrats vote for Thomas;
3. That the 1928 Socialists vote for Foster and Ford; and
4. That the 1928 Communists cast a protest vote for Hoover.

That would give Mr. Hoover some 48,000 votes. He deserves almost every one of them.

WALTER S. HANKEL.

Des Moines, Iowa.

Khaki Shirts and Fascism

SIR: The article in The New Republic of September 21, 1932, entitled "The Khaki Shirts—American Fascists," is not only misleading but untrue.

The Khaki Shirts of America, with national headquarters at 1841 North Capitol Street, Washington, D. C., has no connection whatever with the captains, colonels and generals of any spurious organization which may be seeking publicity or monetary gain through the use of our name. The Khaki Shirts of America, your article to the contrary notwithstanding, is not a Fascist organization. It is not a Red, Communist or Socialist organization. It does not seek the "resignation" of Herbert Hoover. It does not intend to "seize power."

True it is that we *do* seek the defeat of Herbert Hoover, but we do so through the legitimate use of the ballot. If by "seizing power" you mean the defeat of those United States Senators and Congressmen who have in the past displayed more interest in the passage of legislation in behalf of the privileged class to the detriment of the millions of unemployed Americans, then you are unquestionably upon the right track and have gleaned some idea of what we hope to do. . . .

E. F. EVERETT, National Treasurer,
Washington, D. C. The Khaki Shirts of America.

SIR: The article by Nathaniel Weyl on the Khaki Shirts which appeared in a recent issue was most unjust in its implications regarding the organization which has national headquarters here and goes under the title of "The Khaki Shirts of America." Messrs. Everett, Ellison and Walde, the moving spirits behind the enterprise here, are distinctly opposed to any building up of a movement which might become fascist—using the term fascist in the connotation which it usually has for most liberals and radicals. These men abhor militarism and all other forms of repression. The files at their headquarters are filled with their disavowals of the adventure, Art Smith, and his racketeering organization in the Middle West, which Mr. Weyl described in his article.

They have set their faces firmly against any use of military titles in their organization and are attempting to transform it into a nationwide union of the unemployed to obtain adequate shelter and food during the coming winter and to work for all measures in behalf of the unemployed. They have discarded the bonus as an objective and have thrown their membership open to all the unemployed, male and female, of whatever race, over eighteen years of age. Their membership to date is fully 75-percent nonveteran.

Though there are certain aspects of their constitution and their pledge which have what seems to me an unfortunate and even revolting ring of 100-percent patriotism, and though the name of the organization is inherently objectionable to me, they are not wedded either to the exact phraseology of their constitution and pledge or to the title of their organization. In fact, they recognize the unhappy connotations of both and are more than willing to change them at the proper time.

They are now in the process of attempting to forge a program which will aid in obtaining constructive steps for the unemployed. They are in favor of some plan of unemployment insurance, and they view with hope as a possible model for much larger organizations throughout the states the formation and activities of the unemployed unions in Seattle, where these unions have effected a combination based on the barter of goods and services. They have written to the Governors of all the states and to the mayors of all major cities, urging upon them the extreme need of providing concrete plans for the shelter and feeding of the unemployed, suggesting the possibility of setting up cantonments for the unemployed or taking over vacant or nearly vacant apartment houses and other buildings suitable to house the unemployed.

To the end that their program may be an advanced and sound one, they are seeking the counsel of all elements here which are seriously concerned with the problem of the unemployed. They are eager for advice from all disinterested sources and will welcome receiving at their headquarters, 1841 North Capitol Street, all serious suggestions from the readers of this magazine.

GARDNER JACKSON.

Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am very grateful for the informative statements of the aims and activities of "The Khaki Shirts of America" (headquarters Washington, D. C.) which Messrs. Everett and Jackson submit. I am unable, however, to follow Mr. Everett's logic in denouncing my article as "misleading and untrue" when it applies, as he recognizes, to an entirely different organization from the one he is defending. Mr. Jackson likewise begins by describing my article as "most unfair," and concludes by describing its subject, "The Khaki Shirts of America" (headquarters Kansas City) in harsher terms than I should care to employ. As I have made no reference to the Everett-Ellison group, the logic of these strictures is difficult to follow. If Messrs. Everett and Jackson do not care to be connected with what they regard as a "racketeering organization," they might do well to see that their group does not bear its name. This responsibility devolves most evidently on these gentlemen, and not on me.

If the Ellison-Everett group intends to mobilize the unemployed along with the rest of the working class behind the demand for a society in which the producing masses rule politically and industrially, we Socialists will welcome it. If it proposes to lead the unemployed movement into a blind alley which will prevent their taking effective revolutionary action to eradicate the basic causes of their unemployment, then we will not. This question can be answered only by the concrete actions of the Washington Khaki Shirts.

NATHANIEL WEYL.

New York City.

Reward for Heroes

SIR: In your issue of August 10, under the heading of "Bullets for the B. E. F.," you make this statement: "We feel that aside from actual victims of disease or wounds, and their families, no veteran has any claim which is more valid than that of any other American citizen."

I am not a veteran, but I cannot let the above statement go without a protest, as I feel it to be very unfair to those who risked their lives to make this country "safe for democracy." . . .

Our soldiers were fighting for our safety, and we led them to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

believe that their jobs would be waiting for them on their return. Did we mean this or was it another "scrap of paper"? We made a dramatic show for the soldiers who were killed. Many an expensive memorial building is dedicated to "those who so gallantly fought and so bravely laid their lives on their country's altar." But what do we offer the veteran? Nothing.

JOHN B. BRADSHAW.

Trenton, N. J.

"An Amazing Book"

SIR: In respect of Mr. Freeman's reference to my characterization of Isaac Don Levine's book, "Red Smoke," I beg space in which to explain certain circumstances in the case. Some time ago the publishers of Mr. Levine's volume sent me a copy. In acknowledging the receipt of it, I replied in substance (I do not have a copy of my letter at hand) as follows: "It is an amazing book, but I do not feel competent to pass judgment on its soundness." Thereupon, without consulting me, the publisher took the sentence, "It is an amazing book," and used it in his advertisements, ignoring entirely my reservation of judgment. Thus it happens that I appear to be endorsing Mr. Levine's work.

CHARLES A. BEARD.

New Milford, Conn.

Prosperity's Right Here

SIR: I judge from your editorials that you will be extremely disappointed if we really do have good times and if employment gets full and if the country gets prosperous. In that event you would have nothing to criticize and complain about, and that would be distressing. Here at this time when everybody is commencing to feel good, when everything is turning from pessimism into optimism, when the fundamental facts in business are improving in every respect, you write your devastating, gloomy, hypocritical editorials that would tend, if anything could, to put us back in the slough of pessimism. And you do this even though pessimism (and lack of confidence) has been our only trouble, and even though the spirit of optimism and hope and courage and confidence is sure to bring us out of troubles and start the wheels of industry spinning.

Why do you write such editorials in times like these? Why do you assert that the present change in point of view is due to political maneuverings and intimate that as soon as the election is over we will revert to unemployment and depression again. There is absolutely no excuse for such a point of view. It might do you good to read the first few pages in the National City Bank Bulletin of September, 1932.

Yesterday I was talking to our largest banker and he stated that deposits in the bank were increasing rapidly. I talked to a wholesale groceryman who has a number of stores in this district. He stated that their sales for two days of last week were the largest that they had had in eighteen months. They sold bills of goods last week for five new concerns starting up in business. Our largest manufacturer of underwear, and one of the largest in the United States, stated that he could not commence to accept the orders offered and that he expected the price of cotton to be fifteen cents a pound next spring. One of the very largest and most successful manufacturers in this city, whose company is listed on Wall Street, stated that he thought that customers would not be able to get goods within six months.

This is the spirit of the time. Money is getting back into circulation rapidly. Hoarded money is coming out rapidly. The buying power in terms of dollars is being expanded and will doubtless soon be in sufficient amount to more than purchase all the goods produced by all the labor of the country at the present price scale. This increased dollar demand will cause, not only full employment, but an advancing wage scale and, therefore, prosperity. Prices are going up not only in the United States but also in England and Germany. A worldwide optimism is being manifested. It is only necessary now for us to eliminate the croakers and disciples of pessimism. Is it not possible for you to change your point of view? . . .

HUGH W. SANFORD.

Knoxville, Tenn.

A Depression College

SIR: Because of inadequate means many students will be unable to continue their education during the academic year 1932-33 in existing colleges. Similarly many competent teachers find themselves without appointments. It is proposed to unite some members of these complementary groups in a temporary depression college.

The proposed college, basically free from all endowments, charitable gifts and other encumbrances, is to be financed by a student fee of $250 for one academic year of instruction, food and lodging. The explanations for this apparent miracle, whereby ordinary college expenses are reduced to at least one third of normal, are (1) the faculty will be unpaid except for room and board; (2) room rent will amount to approximately fifty cents per month per student; (3) food is to be provided on an army scheme at a cost of less than fifty cents per person per day, and (4) students are to care for their own rooms, and take turns with such duties as waiting on table and washing dishes.

Some twenty experienced teachers with thorough academic training have already applied for positions; adequate accommodations have been obtained in Port Royal, Virginia, a quiet and beautiful village on the Rappahannock River, seventy miles from Washington, D. C.; a suitable library is assured; and the venture has won the confidence of men of acknowledged leadership in education and public affairs.

If there are from fifty to one hundred qualified students, with no less than and little more than $250 to spend on one year of advanced education, we stand ready to join them at Port Royal. If you are interested, write to me at 722 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

A. C. C. HILL, JR.

Washington, D. C.

A Vermont Socialist Party

SIR: The Vermont Socialist party is now being organized. This notice is especially directed to women Socialists and Socialist sympathizers, who are urged to communicate immediately with the undersigned, in order that as many communities as possible be represented on the State Women's Committee, and that all may coöperate in the work of forwarding the Socialist cause.

GRETCHEN J. GARRISON, Chairman,
State Women's Committee, Vermont Socialist Party.

Bennington, Vt.

For the Illinois Miners

SIR: Thirty thousand miners of Illinois are today on strike. They stand embattled against a powerful attempt further to break down their wage scale and standard of living and working conditions—a move that if successful will start this last stronghold of organized miners on the toboggan which will land them at the bottom of the pit of abject and soul-destroying poverty that is the lot of their brother miners in the low-wage fields of West Virginia, Kentucky, western Pennsylvania and almost every other soft-coal field in the United States. . . .

A committee has been appointed by the Springfield local of the Socialist party to help meet the pressing question of strike relief. This committee will gather and distribute foodstuffs and, later, other forms of relief to strikers without regard to differences that exist or may arise within the ranks of the miners and with the sole purpose of strengthening this vanguard of labor in the terrible struggle into which it is plunged. Relief of all kinds is needed, but immediately send foodstuffs and medical supplies to Midwest Striking Miners' Relief Headquarters at 1031 South Eleventh Street, Springfield, Illinois. Cash contributions should be made out to the Midwest Striking Miners' Relief Fund of the Socialist Party, Harold Kelso, Treasurer, 549 Randolph Street, Chicago, Illinois.

REV. DOUGLAS ANDERSON, Chairman,
JOSEPH BRINOCAR, Secretary,
Administrative Committee.

Chicago, Ill.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Henry, William and Henry

The Three Jameses, by C. Hartley Grattan. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 376 pages. $3.50.

Theatre and Friendship, Letters from Henry James to Elizabeth Robins. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 303 pages. $3.50.

IN APPROACHING the three Jameses Mr. Grattan has made a wise and interesting excision. He might have written a group of biographies; he has chosen to portray "a family of minds." At the outset, assembling material that has not appeared elsewhere, he outlines the career of William James of Albany, an Irishman who looked like a stout, skeptical Sir Walter Scott and who created the family fortune. Because of this fortune all the Jameses were united with the leisure class or, at least, were enabled to extend their speculative or artistic enterprises. This fact does not escape Mr. Grattan's notice, but it is only in the latter portions of the study of Henry James the novelist and in the Epilogue that Marxian theory is definitely brought into play. In the portraiture of William James much is said about "individualism," but for most readers this would have only the ordinary connotations.

With his Fourieristic convictions and his valiant struggle against "selfhood" the elder Henry James was closest of the three to communism, in feeling: but it is his bent toward supernaturalism to which Mr. Grattan gives most attention. With admirable tact in quotation he has succeeded in threading the mazes of James's highly individual extension of the Swedenborgian philosophy; at the same time, often by the same close means, he has revealed the oddly mixed elements of James's mind. He was eager for a "sensuous education" for his boys; he repeated the word "sensuous" with alarming frequency for those days; and his irreverence in the face of any settled establishment, whether of church, reputation or mere character, punctuated his most serious discussions. His romping talk about Carlyle alone should long sustain his reputation.

So much is abundantly given, with further lively touches that indicate James's gift for prophecy. But in his assumption that James stood aside from his time because he was uninterested in politics Mr. Grattan commits a double error. There is a question whether the American people have ever been genuinely interested in politics or political thinking; there seems to be no question as to their concern in this period with those general religious and social questions which occupied the elder James. This concern eventuated in action and impregnated literature. James's relationships to both were more highly diversified than Mr. Grattan indicates, just as the general streams of thought and feeling begin farther back than he suggests. To have enlarged the consideration of these relationships would have provided further material for Mr. Grattan's final discussion. James was almost unique among those who touched the communistic cults in never wishing to "join something"—anything! But this charming personal idiosyncrasy did not make him an "individualist" in his ideas, as Mr. Grattan suggests. A wider discussion of the general stream of these ideas, particularly if pedestrian matters like dates had been considered, would also have added greatly to the effect of stature and originality in this Henry James.

In drawing William James, Mr. Grattan has brought into play the urgency, the eagerness, the dramatic fervor, the initiative and pliancy which in so large a measure belonged to his character, again by an adroit use of quotation and by sharp, brief cross-sections of biographical circumstance. It was the distinction of all the Jameses that in some original fashion they seized upon native preoccupations or native modes of thought; and Mr. Grattan has defined clearly, if not with sympathy, those of William James which relate to the American world of pioneering action. But in detail confusions arise that blur this main effect. Mr. Grattan says that James's "judgment of public affairs was corrupted by his individualism. He was pro-Dreyfus, a Little Englander and an anti-Imperialist." Was this corruption? "Fuddled with God he sat and thought," says Mr. Grattan, and quotes Hall's sarcastic comment on James's "anxiety concerning the postmortem future of his soul." Yet a little earlier Mr. Grattan has spoken of James's lack of real concern with the question of immortality and has said that while "he had a firm conviction as to the importance and significance of religion" he was "without any very deep personal warrant for the nature of the religious experience." When Mr. Grattan draws James as "fuddled with God" he says that this attitude "hardly does honor to the realism for which he is justly famous." Dr. Morris R. Cohen has described James's philosophy as one of the romantic philosophies, and Mr. Grattan's own comments suggest the same category. This is extended by his insistence that "The Principles" is striated through and through with autobiography, or as Hall put it, "self-evisceration"—an ugly word for what is usually regarded as a romantic undertaking. A discussion of romanticism as related to the pioneering mind and further, to an explicit theory of "individualism," would have greatly illuminated the mind of William James.

From time to time Mr. Grattan brings out those valuable wheel-horses in philosophical and literary discussion, realism and romanticism, but he does not make them work. They can of course bog discussion—particularly literary discussion—or lead it into the dryest Sahara, but they can also be made to draw up a measure of understanding. As to Henry James, Mr. Grattan says that there is no question which road he took. The effort to discover what Mr. Grattan believes in this connection has led into fascinating by-paths; it has in fact illuminated the whole subject of James's romanticism, but a genuine synthesis here would have helped define a mind and a temperament; it might also have provided a touchstone for James's technique, which Mr. Grattan considers at length. He is hampered further in this connection, as others have been, by regarding James's sally into the theatre as a mistaken venture instead of the result of a deep-seated creative impulse.

Upon materials already existing for this view a rich light is thrown by the letters in "Theatre and Friendship," indicating as they do the comparative success of "The American"—denied even by Percy Lubbock—the high praise accorded "Guy Domville" by Shaw and Archer, and further, James's definite concern with the theatre even after the personal catastrophe. In these letters also a quality becomes plain which Mr. Grattan denies in James, that of genuine mobility within his given sphere. Here is the famous sensibility in constant friendly action. Mr. Grattan insists that Henry James's mind was "passive," in contrast to the "active" mind of his brother William. No creative mind is truly passive. But by this insistence and by his premise that the world which James portrayed was "static," Mr. Grattan leads to his application of an element of Marxian theory. At the end he makes James "an exponent . . . a defender of the leisure class," primarily concerned with "manners," with mere "taste." Undoubtedly the sense of leisure lies within James's novels; Carl Van Doren once called him a "laureate of leisure." But leisure is not necessarily a static affair. Leisure and its happier fruits will

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exist even when the leisure class is abolished, we must hope; and one surmises that Henry James's exquisite and living sense of it may still remain. Nor can a world be called static in which those profound moral conflicts take place which Mr. Grattan has stressed as dominant in James's novels.

As for James's defense of the leisure class—what happens to those innocent Americans, newly released for a life of leisure because of their own exploitative enterprises or those of others? What do they find when they confront Europe and begin to move among the long established leisure class? Corruption, almost invariably: a large bulk of James's writing could be construed as a bold parable of warning. He had an enamored sense of the older world, but with rather more than the artist's feeling for paradox he firmly portrayed its decadences. Mr. Grattan's book as a whole suffers from the lack of firmly held points of reference, and his conclusions, based on Marxian theory, seem somewhat hurriedly superimposed.

CONSTANCE ROURKE.

Where There's Smoke

Red Smoke, by Isaac Don Levine. New York: Robert M. McBride and Company. 134 pages. $2.

IN HIS latest anti-Soviet broadside, Mr. Isaac Don Levine propounds the following thesis:

The Soviet Union is forever condemned "to an existence of relative poverty in the role of a second-rate agricultural state" because, "as far as natural resources are concerned," it ranks "among the lowest countries in the world." Its coal supplies are inadequate; its water power is one of its least assets; it is singularly poor in iron, copper, gold and silver; and its transportation system is hopeless. Under these circumstances, Mr. Levine holds, the Five Year Plan and all other plans for the socialist industrialization of the Soviet Union are bound to fail.

The author professes to rest his case chiefly on the four volumes of the Five Year Plan, published by the State Planning Commission. From this official document Mr. Levine cites numerous passages to show that even the Soviet scientists admit Russia's deficiencies in natural resources of basic importance.

As one reads these impressive citations, one begins to wonder why the Soviet government disregarded the sober advice of its scientists and proceeded to industrialize the country in the face of their pessimistic reports. Mr. Levine explains this paradox simply. There is a bogey man. His name is Stalin and he is the "political boss of the Soviet Union." This bogey man uses the Five Year Plan as a "political football." All the leading Soviet scientists say: "We have nothing"; but the bogey man ignores science and insists: "We have everything." Throughout the book Mr. Levine stresses the alleged contradictions between the Five Year Plan "conceived and laid out by studious scientists," with the bogey man's "perilous application of irresponsible politics to irrefutable economics."

Assuming that the Soviet government has actually departed from the original line of the Five Year Plan, it must be kept in mind that this document is not a sacred scripture intended to remain immutable through eternity. Soviet economic plans are drawn up with the coöperation not only of scientists, but of trade unions, government commissariats, various workers' and peasants' organizations, in fact, the entire working population. The Soviet planning system contains a method completely ignored by Mr. Levine, the method of "counter-planning," whereby the workers at the bench, on the basis of their direct knowledge, modify the economic plan, usually increasing the production quota assigned to them. The discovery of new natural resources or an increase in labor productivity would justify the Soviet authorities in raising the schedules originally laid out by an economic plan. Such has actually been the case, and that is why the Five Year Plan is being completed in four years.

But if the reader will go directly to the Five Year Plan, instead of relying upon Mr. Levine's interpretations of it, he will find no such divergence between the scientists and the government as Mr. Levine predicates. The author produces his melancholy picture by tearing citations out of their context, distorting their meaning, and falsifying the main line of the document. Let us consider the single matter of Russia's fuel resources. Far from supporting Mr. Levine's thesis that the Soviet Union lacks the fuel required for its industrial program, the Five Year Plan (Vol. II, Part I, p. 11) specifically declares that *"there is no doubt whatever that the fuel resources of the Soviet Union are sufficiently large to ensure the achievement of the industrialization of the country to an unlimited degree."*

The Soviet Union does not plan, as Mr. Levine implies, the development of its industries on the basis of imported coal. When the Plan discusses coal "imports" in this respect, it refers to imports from one part of the Soviet Union to other parts, but not from other countries. Indeed, the document specifically designates the Don Basin as the chief source for European Russia of such internal coal imports.

It is true that the Soviet Union imports some coal, but a comparison of such imports with exports renders Mr. Levine's jeremiad utterly ridiculous. Thus, in 1928-29, the first year of the Five Year Plan, the Soviet Union imported 53,340 tons of coal, but exported 1,150,629 tons. In 1930 coal imports totaled 63,618 tons, while exports totaled 1,857,752 tons; and in 1931 imports totaled 106,603 tons, while exports were 1,676,811 tons.

The Soviet Union imports these relatively small quantities of coal because it is cheaper for Soviet ships unloading goods at British ports, for example, to return to Leningrad with cargoes of coal than it is to ship coal by rail from the Don Basin to Leningrad. Far from being deficient in coal, the Soviet Union has resources estimated at more than 552 billion tons, which placed it fourth among the countries of the world in regard to coal reserves. The United States Department of Commerce, in its report on the coal industry of the world published in Washington in 1930, does not share Mr. Levine's pessimism regarding Soviet coal resources, but says that these resources "at the present rate of production would suffice for over 12,500 years."

Mr. Levine's assertion that the Soviet Union "is one of the poorest countries in the world in regard to iron-ore deposits" is flatly contradicted by those "studious scientists" of the Soviet Union whom he professes to admire so deeply. These report that in 1931 iron-ore deposits in the U.S.S.R. were about 37,000,000,000 tons, or about 16 percent of the world's total. The enormous iron deposits of the Kursk magnetic anomoly in the Central Black Soil Region will alone probably exceed 210,000,000,000 tons, an amount nearly equal to the total known deposits of the world today.

Soviet figures regarding iron-ore deposits have been checked and verified by twenty American engineers who for the past two years have worked in the Soviet Union as advisers to the iron and steel industry. The findings of these twenty engineers were summarized by one of their number, Mr. R. C. Allen, president of the Lake Superior

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Iron Ore Association. In Steel of April 18, 1932, Mr. Allen writes:

> So far as concerns the [iron] ore supplies, it may be said that the plans of the Russian government to utilize them at the rate of something like 40,000,000 tons a year are well grounded. The ore is available at that rate of production. It is entirely feasible to mine from Krivoi Rog at the rate of 30,000,000 tons per year, and there are no natural economic barriers to the development of a great metallurgical industry based on these ores.

This American engineer, on the basis of direct observation, also differs from Mr. Levine regarding Russia's industrial prospects. "There is no question whatever," he says in the same article, "that the iron ores of Krivoi Rog and Kertch, the coke of the Don Basin, the manganese of Nikopol, the water power of the Dnieper River and the oil of the Caucasus combine to render South Russia one of the world's most favored industrial regions."

In view of the numerous misstatements and internal contradictions of Mr. Levine's latest attack on the Soviet Union, one is inclined to agree with Professor Charles A. Beard's opinion displayed on the book-jacket; it is, indeed, "an amazing book"; and what is most amazing about it is the author's gall. He takes a document which specifically *plans* the socialist industrialization of Russia and, by distorting citations out of the context, attempts to create the impression that this official plan maintains the impossibility of its own objective. JOSEPH FREEMAN.

A letter from Dr. Beard printed on page 264 indicates that the quotation on the jacket of "Red Smoke" was unauthorized and misleading.—THE EDITORS.

"Shootes of Everlastingnesse"

Issues of Immortality: A Study in Implications, by Corliss Lamont. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 198 pages. $1.50.

THE ISSUE of immortality itself is not the issue of this brief book; rather, the doctrine is assumed and the various modern positions which have been taken up on the subject are studied. Professor Lamont does not take sides. He only raises questions: does, say, Dr. Fosdick's conception of immortality have "emotional efficacy, imaginative reality and intellectual acceptability"? What are the values which any particular doctrine of immortality implies? In other words, the doctrines of immortality are schematized, their various adequacies and inadequacies examined with dispassion. The principal conclusion Professor Lamont reaches is that the soul and body are inseparable however the problem is construed, and that their nature partakes of the metaphysical structure of the universe, whatever that structure may be.

Reduced to so simple a statement of method and conclusions, the patient and careful substance of the book seems to fall away, when as a matter of fact the book sustains the weight of the subject admirably. The issues are clarified and pertinently stated. No conception of life after death is dismissed as unworthy of consideration, even though it displays enormous gaps in its logical fabric. The only feeling of inadequacy that arises when the essay is over is one of inconclusion. Not that anyone can be expected to clear up for all time the subject of immortality. It is simply that the problem has as a whole a corollary—namely, disbelief in immortality, which in turn affects the attitude toward death profoundly. And a profound change in the attitude toward death is one of the issues of immortality. To consider it would have made the essay at least twice as long. It might have meant considering the ancient notion of death as opposed to modern beliefs—the beliefs, for example, that motivate a movie like Dovjenko's "Soil" or D. H. Lawrence's work or even Whitehead's—and that would be a lengthy task. Briefly Professor Lamont touches the very core of his problem in his first paragraph, but he leaves it to go on to a positive criticism of immortalists, detracting not at all from the acuteness of his work, but denying to it a profundity it could have possessed.

KENNETH WHITE.

The Dispossessed

Peace Broke Out, by Heinz Leipmann. Translated by Emile Burns. New York: Harrison Smith and Robert Haas. $2.50.

Fired, by Karl Aloys Schenzinger. Translated by S. Guy Endore. New York: The Century Company. $2.

THE CHARGE most frequently brought against "proletarian" fiction is, of course, its inevitable tendency to propaganda. Merely from an esthetic point of view, hostile critics say, the inclusion of doctrine in emotional literature is disastrous. Sympathetic criticism has had to meet this attack by the difficult task of showing how emotion and doctrine have been combined in classic works, or by declaring moralistically that they must be combined. But these two novels give the defenders of indoctrinated fiction an opportunity to make a counter-attack by asserting the esthetic importance of doctrine; for "Peace Broke Out" and "Fired" fail esthetically because of their very lack of it.

Both novels deal with economic misery in Germany. Their characters are of the dispossessed middle class—shopkeepers, minor functionaries, office workers, professional men: the tail which the bourgeoisie leaves in the trap. Materially dispossessed from the middle class, these people are spiritually alien to the proletariat and its objective rebellion; they can face their ruin only with the passive emotions of "pride," self-reproach, loneliness and pointless hate. Perhaps their chief characteristic is their refusal to discover the cause of their cataclysm, their inability to understand their position.

"Peace Broke Out" depicts this class in the early hysteria of ruin. "Fired" shows it when it has learned to cohere and act, but only according to the pseudo-doctrine of Hitlerism, a mere crystallization of irrational hate directed against a false objective. This refusal by the middle class of rational understanding is uncritically reflected in both novels and is the source of their failure.

"Peace Broke Out" is not an untalented book. There are isolated passages on the misery and cruelty of the inflation period which are genuinely effective. But this occasional effectiveness is lost in the melodramatic mysticism by which the author renders the scene. This is no mere fault of expression. It is the direct result of the author's attitude toward the central fact of the book, the inflation—an attitude of primitive awe as though before an animistic and malevolent natural force. Nowhere is there a hint that the inflation was a political event and, as such, man-made and controllable. With such a view of the economic basis of life, it is inevitable that the book should be what it is—full of religiosity and sentimentality and, as art, entirely unresolved.

"Fired," a less talented book, is if anything more con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fused, despite the presence of a declared Hitlerite prejudice. The emotions with which its characters meet ruin have all the dull propriety of movie emotions. The heroine, tempted to marry a rich man, is a cinema cliché with pretty legs; her brave despair as she "faces life anew" in an already almost bankrupt shop is an idiocy of which the author approves. And when the pulpy unemployed hero, after a moment's flirtation with Communism, joins the Nazis with appropriate knightly emotions, while his Hitlerite mentor says a few good words for the Communists, we have confusion worse confounded. No one in the book has the slightest notion of what either party is about, but the hero gets considerable consolation from target practice.

And as one watches the absurdity of his popping pistol, of his fiancée making her gesture in the shop, of the dope-filled Werthers of "Peace Broke Out," one realizes how necessary—how esthetically necessary—doctrine may be to a novel. Just as, in political life, a class without a centralizing and rational doctrine disintegrates into an eventually weak and unvital factor, so in art the spectacle of mass suffering set down without doctrine of cause or cure, degenerates into hysteria or stupidity.

LIONEL TRILLING.

Prohibition and the Courts

Ill Starred Prohibition Cases, by Forrest Revere Black. Boston: The Gorham Press. 162 pages. $2.

PROFESSOR Black is an impassioned foe not only of prohibition as a social experiment, but also of the evils of crime, espionage and infringement of liberty which have accompanied attempts at enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment. Despairing of any change in the Constitution in the calculable future—his book was written before the two Chicago conventions—he realizes, nevertheless, the ineptitude of mere nullification, and points out that it is unthinkable there should be any liquor traffic untaxed and unregulated. He sketches a form of temporary nullification by virtue of which the forbidding of certain aspects of liquor trading would both tax and regulate without legalizing. As a prelude to this discussion he analyzes various court decisions which have, in his opinion, unwarrantably restricted both individual and property rights.

Unfortunately Professor Black has not permitted his wider vision to dominate this book. Both its title and the foreword by Mr. Darrow are misleading. Here is no ordered critique of prohibition enforcement, or even of the juridical errors the courts have fallen into in their zeal to uphold the new policy. Instead we have a collection of articles lacking structural connection and harmonious relation. In several of the papers the same subjects and even identical legal decisions are treated entirely *de novo*.

Practically half the book concerns itself with searches and seizures. And of this, by far the greater portion presents in detail the analysis of a single case in which the search for liquor, without warrant, of a moving automobile was upheld on the ground that the officers had reasonable cause to believe a crime was being committed. Two other decisions of the Supreme Court form the subject of separate, although briefer, chapters: one, the case upholding the right of Congress to limit physicians in their prescription of alcohol for medicinal purposes; the other, that in which the Court held that evidence obtained by tapping telephone wires did not constitute a search or seizure and that such evidence was admissible, even though wire tapping was a crime in the state in which it took place.

Certain policies established by Congress come in for the author's criticism. One of these is the use of the injunction to supplant criminal prosecution; another, the forfeiture of property used illegally, despite the innocence of the real owner or mortgagee of such property. The National Prohibition Act protects an innocent mortgagee, though perhaps not a purchaser, but the tariff law does not. Accordingly, in a group of cases decided May 2, 1932, the Supreme Court, speaking by Mr. Justice Cardozo, has held that where property was used to bring liquor into the United States the rights of the mortgagee were lost.

As Professor Black suggests, the Supreme Court in these prohibition cases has been exercising its time-honored function of formulating the public policy of the nation. There can be no doubt that the increased activities of the federal government have produced many curtailments of liberty in the past, as witness various wartime decisions as well as some of these discussed in the book at hand. Tomorrow, lest worse befall, it may be the turn of business to see destroyed its liberty freely to compete. For, as new emergencies arise, new rules of policy must be laid down and new law made by the Court. The literature of this function of the Court remains inadequate. As a partial contribution to that subject the book under review has indubitable interest and value. It is a pity that Professor Black's approach seems rather that of a defeated litigant seeking a rehearing than that of a scholar or publicist desirous of focusing attention on vital principles.

OSMOND K. FRAENKEL.

Book Notes

BIOGRAPHY AND MEMOIRS

THE ESSENTIAL SHAKESPEARE: A Biographical Adventure, by J. Dover Wilson. *New York: The Macmillan Company. 158 pages. $1.50.*

After Georg Brandes and Frank Harris, it is hardly an "adventure" to write of Shakespeare as an artist and poet, instead of treating him as a successful man of business, like Dowden, Lee and other Victorian biographers. But it seems to us that the real contribution to Shakespearean criticism made by the co-editor of "The New Shakespeare" in this little book consists in placing Shakespeare in his Elizabethan environment—Stratford, London, the theatre, the nobles upon whose patronage it depended, the court; to a less extent, also the Jacobean environment and the accompanying change in the social mood. But perhaps the most fascinating thing in this stimulating sketch is the discussion of the Grafton portrait, reproduced as the frontispiece. This portrait was discovered in 1907. An inscription at the top tells that it was painted in 1588, and that the subject was then twenty-four years of age, so that he was an exact contemporary of Shakespeare. A comparison with the Droeshout engraving, made after the Stratford bust, reveals a perfect identity of facial measurements, from chin to forehead. Can this portrait possibly be that of young Shakespeare? There are no other data to lead to this conclusion; yet the eyes, the Shelleylike oval of the face, the great forehead, strongly suggest that a poet or artist of no mean order may have been its model.

ALEXANDER THE GREAT: by Ulrich Wilcken. *Translated from the German by G. C. Richards. New York: The Dial Press. 347 pages. $4.*

To the modern world, Alexander the Great is something of a legendary figure, and Professor Wilcken's work has the great merit of leaving legend wholly out of consideration. Here is a sober, at times dry, effort to describe the evolving of a historical personality against a historical background; the roots are provided as well as the flower. Part I, serving as a kind of introduction, gives a picture of the Greek world in the fourth century down through the reign of Philip II of Macedonia, the father of Alexander; Part II begins with a sketch of the young prince himself. The historian tries to reconcile the two opposing conceptions

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of this extraordinary man who achieved so much, though he lived to be only thirty-two; he explains his dual nature on grounds of genius. He sees in his nature romantic and mystical traits which did not hinder him from being a great economist. Professor Wilcken's work appears to have made use of all available material and is conclusive and valuable.

MARY WOLLSTONECRAFT: A Sketch, by H. R. James. *New York: Oxford University Press. 180 pages. $2.50.*

To date there has been no complete revaluation of Mary Wollstonecraft and her relation to the Godwin circle. Aside from Godwin's "Memoir" little of permanent value has been published concerning the remarkable woman who wrote "A Vindication of the Rights of Women" and a famous reply to Edmund Burke's "Reflections on the French Revolution." The present sketch is by no means so intelligent as the short biography by Madeline Linford which was published in 1924. Mr. James is conscientious and exact, but he is obviously the wrong person to reinterpret Mary Wollstonecraft to the present generation. The dedication of the book to the Right Honorable Stanley Baldwin indicates at once where Mr. James's political sympathies lie. From then onward he treats his subject as "a noble" creature, which is all very well but does not clarify the social issues that made his heroine an important figure in the history of English liberalism.

MEMOIRS OF A SOUTHERN WOMAN OF LETTERS, by Grace King. *New York: The Macmillan Company. 398 pages. $4.*

A book of recollections from the late Grace King, the author of "New Orleans," "The Pleasant Ways of St. Medard" and other well known books, as well as a leading historian of Louisiana and of the French origins of her part of the United States. This posthumous work deals with a long life (1852-1931) spent for the most part in New Orleans and on neighboring plantations, and recounts at length the writer's friendship among artists, statesmen and authors. The notes on the great Gayarré, the father and chief among historians of French America, are copious. There are detailed accounts also of such subjects as Mark Twain and his family, Charles Dudley Warner, William Dean Howells and many others. The places recounted include not only America but England and Italy as well, and especially Paris, where she found in many ways only an extension of the mind and scene to which she had been always accustomed.

History

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN MEXICAN RELATIONS, by James Morton Callahan. *New York: The Macmillan Company. 644 pages. $4.*

In this volume, Professor Callahan of the University of West Virginia reviews the relations of the United States and Mexico since colonial times. His account, based on solid research in the State Department archives, brings to light many interesting documents in this field of history, particularly those relating to our fear of the British on the Pacific coast. It is to be regretted that the author has not made use of more Mexican sources and that he has overlooked such works as Justin Smith's "War with Mexico." Mr. Callahan's style makes formidable reading.

Fiction

A NEW YORK TEMPEST, by Manuel Komroff. *New York: Coward-McCann. $2.50.*

"A New York Tempest" is an attempt to recreate New York society of a hundred years ago. The murder of Jane Holden lines up the opposed forces of society against each other. The law-and-order groups, made up of moral reform societies, the wealthy, the young clerks, demand the release of the murderer; while the thugs, gangsters and prostitutes unite to demand his punishment. The attempt to make a social issue of the crime does not succeed in spite of well written passages describing the tension in the city and the antagonism between the upper and lower classes. Something seems left out; it is unbelievable that so much feeling could be whipped up over the actual crime, and one feels that it must have merely brought to the surface antagonisms which were latent before. The situation never reaches its threatened crisis, and the novel ends in confused and rambling melodrama.

THE SEA TYRANT, by Peter Freuchen. *New York: Liveright, Inc. $2.*

Readers with a taste for sadism will enjoy this book. Most of the forms of physical suffering play a part in it. The hero, Danco Kellar, is a monster whose cruelties Freuchen justifies first by the theory that in hard lands like the Arctic man must be correspondingly hard and, second, by the passive cruelty practised upon him by his absent wife, goading him to fury. More important and interesting are the descriptions of the life of the Eskimos and their dealings with the whalers' crews. In these passages Freuchen recaptures the quality of his extraordinary novel, "Eskimo."

Contributors

OWEN P. WHITE, a native of Texas, lived in that state for forty-five years before coming to New York City to accept a position with The New York Times. For the last seven years his work has appeared regularly in Collier's and occasionally in The American Mercury and other magazines.

GIFFORD PINCHOT, the present Governor of Pennsylvania, needs no further introduction to our readers.

RAYMOND HOLDEN, author of a biography of Lincoln and of a book of verse, "Granite and Alabaster," is at present on the editorial staff of Fortune.

YVOR WINTERS, who has contributed poetry and criticism to various magazines and has published three volumes of verse, is teaching English at Stanford University.

HELEN CORNELIUS is a young American poet who has lived for several years in France.

MARGARET MEAD, Assistant Curator of Anthropology at the Museum of Natural History in New York City, is the author of "Coming of Age in Samoa" and "Growing Up in New Guinea." She is at present in the district of the Sepik River in New Guinea.

MARK VAN DOREN, the author of four volumes of verse ("Jonathan Gentry" was the most recent), has edited an anthology of world poetry, an anthology of American poetry from 1630 to 1930, and "The Oxford Book of American Prose," to be published this fall under his editorship.

LÉONIE ADAMS, the author of two volumes of verse, "Those Not Elect" and "High Falcon," is at present living at her home in Hillburn, New York.

LOUIS UNTERMEYER's most recent contribution to the field of poetry is "The Book of Living Verse," a collection of verse ranging from pre-Chaucerian days to the present, and "Food and Drink," a volume of verse of his own. Both of these volumes will appear during the fall under the imprint of Harcourt, Brace.

HAROLD LEWIS COOK, who is preparing a short biography and a complete critical bibliography of Edna St. Vincent Millay, is to have a volume of his verse published by Harper's next January.

PAUL ROSENFELD, music, art and literary critic has published one novel, "Boy in the Sun," and is at present working on a second.

CONSTANCE ROURKE has written several books of American history and biography, her most recent contribution to this field being "American Humor: A Study of the American Character."

JOSEPH FREEMAN, who collaborated with Scott Nearing in writing "Dollar Diplomacy," is the author of a book on Russia, "The Soviet Worker," which was published last month by Liveright.

KENNETH WHITE, poet and playwright, has contributed literary and dramatic criticism to The Hound and Horn and other literary magazines.

LIONEL TRILLING, who teaches English at Columbia University, is writing a biography of Matthew Arnold.

OSMOND K. FRAENKEL is an attorney of New York City, the author of "The Sacco-Vanzetti Case" and a contributor to legal periodicals.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SHUBERT THEATRE 44th St. WEST of B'WAY.

ON WITH THE DANCE!

"With the Charles Weidman and Doris Humphrey dancers the musical revue begins to acquire plastic ideas. To the tune of 'Satan's Little Lamb' they dance a fantastic number in the best vein of the modern stage. But Charles Weidman's Lithographic portrait of a Madison Square bout has a descriptive rhythm which gives the dance a new prestige in the theatre, and the ballet of waves sweeping across a beach is breathlessly lovely"—*Brooks Atkinson, New York Times.*

The Most Novel Revue Ever Staged! Company of 80

"AMERICANA"

Eve's 8:30 Mats WED. and SAT. at 2:30.

MOTION PICTURE

Maedchen in Uniform

"A WORK OF ART

Something to revive one's faith in the cinema."—
Richard Watts, in Herald-Tribune.

CRITERION THEATRE, B'way & 44th St. TWICE DAILY 2:45 8:45

3 Performances Sat. and Sunday—2:50—5:30—8:50

THE NEW YORK PSYCHOANALYTIC INSTITUTE
324 West 86th Street
announces a lecture on

Dreams and Their Function

Lecturer: MONROE A. MEYER, M.D.

Friday, October 14th, at 8:20 P.M. Admission 75c

PSYCHOLOGY and LIFE

A Series of Eight Lectures by Eminent Authorities
Mondays at 8:30, October 17 to December 5

Arranged with the assistance of DR. JOHN B. WATSON

CAN HUMAN BEINGS BE BETTERED BY BREEDING?
DR. H. S. JENNINGS — Johns Hopkins University

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
DR. FLOYD ALLPORT — Syracuse University

MEASURING FITNESS FOR WORK
DR. MORRIS S. VITELES — University of Pennsylvania

TRENDS IN BIOLOGY
DR. CLARENCE COOK LITTLE
Formerly President University of Michigan

THE FREUDIAN CONTRIBUTION TO PSYCHOLOGY
DR. A. A. BRILL
Author, "Fundamental Conceptions of Psychoanalysis"

PSYCHOLOGY and LEARNING ABILITY
DR. ARTHUR I. GATES, Professor of Psychology, Teachers' College

THE RELATION BETWEEN PSYCHIATRY AND CRIMINOLOGY
DR. BERNARD GLUECK — Author, "Studies in Forensic Psychiatry"

ON GESTALT THEORY
DR. KURT KOFFKA — Author, "The Growth of the Mind"

Fee for the course, $3.00; single admission, 50c
Write, phone or call for further information
or for bulletin announcing other courses.

Rand School of Social Science
7 E. 15th St, AI.4-3094

BOOKS

New **HOLT** *Books*

ISSUES OF IMMORTALITY
A Study in Implications
by Corliss Lamont. "In this admirable book, Mr. Corliss Lamont has rendered a service in keeping the doctrine of immortality as understood by the plain man, and as taught by the Catholic Church, the Fundamentalists, and the Spiritualists, quite distinct from the various substitute doctrines that have been offered under the same name by philosophers and others."—*Principal L. P. Jacks in The Saturday Review of Literature.* $1.50

RELIGION IN VARIOUS CULTURES
by Horace L. Friess and Herbert W. Schneider. A case-book of *group* religious experience, describing religious traditions, institutions, and arts. More than two hundred illustrations. $4.00

THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION
by Paul Tillich. (Translated by H. Richard Niebuhr). The self-sufficient spirit of bourgeois society in the nineteenth century has been broken by a revolt in science, art, economic life, politics, and of course in religion. This book, a miniature philosophy of history, appraises that revolt. $1.50

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY, Inc.
ONE PARK AVENUE — NEW YORK

Communism or Fascism in Germany?

What Next?

by

LEON TROTSKY

Paper, 35c. 192 pages. Cloth, 65c.
PIONEER PUBLISHERS,
84 E. 10th Street — N. Y. City

LECTURES

SCOTT NEARING
will lecture Monday evening, October 17th, at 8:30, on
THE CRUMBLING OF WESTERN EUROPE
at the
INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED EDUCATION
Irving Plaza
Irving Place, at 15th Street, New York City
Single admission, 50c. Tel.; PEnnsylvania 6-2999

ALFRED ADLER
foremost Viennese psychiatrist, will open his American lecture activities with a series of eight lectures on
INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOLOGY AND HUMAN NATURE
beginning Tuesday, October 18th, at 8:30 at the
INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED EDUCATION
Irving Plaza, Irving Place at 15th Street, N. Y. City
Course ticket $3.50 Single admission 50c.
Tel.: PEnnsylvania 6-2999

DISCUSSION

THE GROUP
Meets at 150 West 85th Street
Tuesday Eve., October 18th, at 8:30 P. M.
DR. A. FICHANDLER
speaks on:
"RUSSIA REVISITED"
Sunday Afternoon, Oct. 23d, at 4:30 P. M.
SEYMOUR A. SELIGSON speaks on:
"LIBERATION OF AMERICAN LITERATURE"

GENERAL

Lucy Maxwell Hodge—Literary Adviser
6 Craigie Circle, Cambridge, Mass.
Trained in leading publishing house. Experienced aid for inexperienced authors from one thoroughly informed concerning standards of publishers and magazine editors.

The World Is Waiting for the Sunrise. But why wait? Hundreds of highly cultured members of Contacts, only correspondence club for the intellectually marooned, are NOW spreading the sunshine of genuine fellowship and comradery. Send 3c stamp for details. **Contacts,** 211 East 11th Street, N. Y. City.

RESORT

PLAY OR WORK THIS AUTUMN ON LARGE COLONIAL ESTATE
BEST SOUTHERN COOKING
FREE GOLF AND TENNIS
RATES: $12.00 TO $16.00 WEEKLY
Major Marshall W. MacDonald
MEDIA FARM
Charles Town — West Virginia

POSITIONS WANTED

Woman copy editor and writers' assistant wants responsible, full-time job. Offers constructive criticism and revision, research, preparation of matter for press, titling, proof-reading, indexing, writing of advertising. Excellent references. Address: Box 714, The New Republic.

Woman, college non-graduate, cultural background, experienced in field work, lobbying, traveling, publicity, secretarial work, etc., east and west coast, seeks interesting job. Will go anywhere. Address: Box 721, The New Republic.

Young Lady, Protestant, Smith graduate, high literary, intellectual ability, graduate degree; assist scholar, author, writing, research, full, part time; expert typist, proof-reader; anywhere, New England school or college town preferred. Address: Box 723, The New Republic.

SHARE APARTMENT

Young French businessman, 30, tall clean-cut, cultured; world-traveled, fluent Spanish; fond arts and outdoors; would like to share modern apartment midtown or village in exchange for French conversation. Address: Box 724. The New Republic.

BACHELOR desires large room in small private family or will share expenses of small apartment. Owner of many books and will occupy November first. Address: Box 726, The New Republic.

FOR RENT

Sunny room, furnished or unfurnished in attractive law offices, available for writer, research worker, consultant or accountant. Telephone switchboard service. References required. 51 E. 42nd Street. MUrray Hill 2-6321.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED